

To honor the secretaries already performing their duties with diligence; to pay tribute to those constantly striving to improve their skills and abilities better to equip themselves as a part of the management team; and to encourage others to enter this worthy profession, it is essential that rightful recognition be given.

Therefore, during this special week we should fully honor the first lady of business—the American secretary.

SINCLAIR WEEKS,  
Secretary of Commerce.  
LILYAN MILLER,  
President, National Secretary Association.

SHELDON F. HALL,  
President, Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute.

### Confusing and Discouraging

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if there is one policy of the Eisenhower administration which has received the united support of Republicans, as well as substantial support of

Democrats, it is the effort to get the Government out of businesses which can be carried on by individuals or private organizations.

This because thinking individuals know that, inasmuch as Government depends upon tax dollars for its existence, every time the Government eliminates a business which pays taxes it lessens its ability to operate—or must replace the lost tax by additional levies.

In the 83d Congress, without opposition, the House passed a bill introduced by me, the purpose of which was to get the Government out of taxpaying businesses. It was late in the session, hence, the bill did not reach the floor of the Senate.

The administration, by Executive action, has been trying to get the Government out of civilian activities, but legislation is needed.

May 12, last, when the bill making appropriations of \$31,488,206,000 for the Department of Defense came before the House, it carried a section which made it difficult for the administration to curtail Government operations. An amendment designed to further the administration's purpose to get the Government out of activities usually performed by taxpayers was first adopted by the House when in committee by a vote of 160 to 134, but, then on rollcall, was defeated by a vote of 102 to 184. Some Members for no apparent reason reversed their position.

#### INCONSISTENCY

When the amendment came on for a vote in committee, those who had supported a similar principle in the 83d Congress again consistently voted for it; but on the rollcall vote, many switched positions and voted against it.

Naturally, no Member attempts to tell another how he should vote but it certainly is surprising to see Members of Congress within an hour on as simple and sound a proposition as was this do an about face.

Perhaps one reason for a switch from a position designed to protect the taxpayers to one permitting the Government to engage in commercial activities was in part due to the fact that the Member had a Government enterprise in his District.

The vote not only found the leaders on the Republican side in opposite camps but it also found top-ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations on opposite sides.

#### DISCOURAGING

Here is the discouraging feature of that action. Everyone knows that, if the Federal Government is to transact the business normally carried on by taxpayers, whether it be production, transportation, merchandizing, or storage of any item, crowding the taxpayer out, ultimately it will destroy itself. Republicans missed the boat on this one. Reason—lack of vigilance, party organization, personal interest.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, turning aside for this hallowed moment from the violence and turbulence of these embittered days, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. In Thy presence our faith is strengthened in the supremacy of ultimate decencies. In the silence we hear the ancient assurance: Be still, and know that I am God.

We pray that Thy cool hand may be laid upon our fretting natures and our fevered spirits. Make us quiet before Thee, quiet enough to see the paths our feet must tread, quiet enough to hear Thy voice, quiet enough to realize that in Thy will is our peace and that Thou wilt never leave us without guidance. Teach us by Thy lessons. Show us Thy purpose. Sober us by Thy chastisements, and make us the instruments of a durable peace as in this hour of crisis and tension we lift our living Nation a single sword to Thee. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 11, 1955, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1831) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods

from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the task force of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until next Tuesday at noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and me-

morials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with statements made in connection therewith limited to 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT CHAPLAIN AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION AND STORAGE OF CERTAIN HOUSEHOLD GOODS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON STATE OF THE FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the state of the Finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

#### AUDIT REPORT OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in the Smokemont Campground in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### LEASE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS FOR MINING PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to modify the authority to lease for mining purposes allotted Indian lands owned by Indian heirs or devisees of allottees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### SETTLEMENT OF DEBTS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain debts of individual Indians and Indian tribal organizations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### CAPT. WILLIAM S. AHALT ET AL.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Capt. William S. Ahalt, and others (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF MORONGO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS, CALIFORNIA, AND THE OSAGE NATION OF INDIANS V. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of the claims of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians of California, and the Osage Nation of Indians v. The United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

#### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

#### "Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Whereas Alabama is predominantly an agricultural State and the prosperity and welfare of the farmers is fundamental to the welfare of the whole State; and

"Whereas under the laws of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use his discretion in setting quotas for agricultural products and in determining what percentage of parity the various agricultural products shall have; and

"Whereas under this system the percent of parity allowed producers of many agricultural products has been greatly reduced to the detriment of Alabama farmers; and

"Whereas several acts are now pending in the United States Congress which will provide price supports for many agricultural products of 90 percent or more of parity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation which will guarantee price supports for basic agricultural products of at least 90 percent of parity; be it further

"Resolved, That each member of the Alabama delegation in Congress be commended for his support of legislation to provide a sound and fair program for promoting and developing agriculture throughout the Nation, and especially for his efforts to guarantee price supports to farmers; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of the senate to the clerk of each House of the United States Congress and a copy hereof be sent to each Member of the delegation in Congress from Alabama."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

#### "Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to include coffee under the parity payment program

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed numerous legislative measures assisting farmers in the production of specific agricultural commodities; and

"Whereas in order to encourage coffee growing in the Territory Federal support through programs authorized by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is necessary: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to include coffee among the basic agricultural commodities assisted and supported by programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended,

and to authorize parity payments to coffee-growers in the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Delegate to the Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution requesting the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii to seek Federal aid in investigating the commercial uses for methods of destruction of lava beds

"Whereas large areas of the Territory of Hawaii, particularly on the island of Hawaii, have been and are from time to time covered by lava flows resulting from the eruption of volcanoes in the Territory; and

"Whereas serious economic loss has resulted from the destruction caused by such eruptions of lava and considerable areas have been rendered unusable for long periods of time as a result thereof; and

"Whereas any means of destroying flows or fields of solidified lava or making commercial use thereof or to scientifically disintegrate or facilitate the deterioration of lava beds so as to make them cultivable would be of great economic benefit to the Territory: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii is hereby requested to determine what agencies of the Federal Government are equipped for research and investigation of the uses of lava or destruction of lava fields and request that such research be afforded the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. The Delegate to Congress is further requested, in the event that such agencies are unable to proceed with such research, investigation, and assistance in the absence of an appropriation or appropriations, to request that the Congress of the United States make the necessary appropriation or appropriations therefor.

"SEC. 3. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 9th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

#### "Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to amend section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920

"Whereas the Hawaii Irrigation Authority, created by Act 245 of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, proposes to construct an irrigation and water utilization project upon the island of Molokai, designed primarily to serve and supply the lands of the Hawaiian Homes Commission on Molokai; and

"Whereas a portion of the funds necessary for the construction of said project have been appropriated by chapter 317 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, and additional funds will be required for the completion of said project, some of which funds may be sought from Congress; and



"Whereas said chapter 317 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, contemplates that the funds appropriated therein shall be spent in accordance with the provisions of said chapter, including the requirements that the same be repaid to the Territory of Hawaii out of charges made for water supplied from such system to said Hawaiian Homes Commission lands; and

"Whereas section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 715 (d)), authorizes the commission to use, for the purpose of adequately irrigating any tract, Government-owned water upon the island of Molokai free of all charge; and

"Whereas to enable the construction of said irrigation and water utilization system and the expenditure of the funds appropriated therefor by said chapter 317, an amendment to section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act is required to allow charges to be made for water supplied from such system to said Hawaiian Homes Commission lands: Now, therefore

*"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is, requested to enact legislation amending section 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 715 (d)), so as to allow charges to be made for Government-owned water supplied to Hawaiian Homes Commission lands on the island of Molokai for irrigation purposes; and to that end the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"A bill to amend section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920

*"Be it enacted, etc.—*

"SECTION 1. That section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 (42 Stat. 114, 48 U. S. C. 715 (d)), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words "Government-owned water upon the island of Molokai, and" appearing therein between the words "charge" and "Government-owned", and by deleting therefrom the words "any of the water upon the island of Molokai, and" appearing therein between the words "charge" and "any."

"Sec. 2. Said section 221 (d), Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920, is hereby further amended by adding a new paragraph thereto, to read as follows:

"Any funds which may be appropriated by Congress as a grant-in-aid for the construction of an irrigation and water utilization system on the island of Molokai designed to serve Hawaiian Homes Commission lands, and which are not required to be reimbursed to the Federal Government, shall be deemed to be payment in advance by the Hawaiian Homes Commission and lessees of the Hawaiian Homes Commission of charges to be made to them for the construction of such system and shall be credited against such charges when made."

"Sec. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval."

"Sec. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

*"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."*

#### "Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, relating to provisions contained in patents, agreements, and leases

"Whereas it appears that many of the irrigation projects to be organized by the Hawaii Irrigation Authority will include large segments of public land; and

"Whereas in conjunction with said irrigation projects and in furtherance of the Government's program of homesteading and development of small-scale farming much of said public land will be sold for homesteads and farm lots pursuant to the provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act; and

"Whereas to secure the success of said irrigation projects with the resultant benefits thereof to the homesteaders and others participating in said irrigation projects it is necessary to preclude the withdrawing of land from an irrigation project, to the detriment of others participating in the project, after the project has been formed; and

"Whereas the power of the commissioner of public lands to require the retention of lands in irrigation projects is not expressly stated in the Hawaiian Organic Act: Now, therefore

*"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact legislation expressly granting authority to the commissioner of public lands to provide for the inclusion and retention in irrigation projects of public lands sold for homesteads and farm lots, and to that end the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"A bill to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act

*"Be it enacted, etc.—*

"SECTION 1. That section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph thereto:

"The Commissioner may include in any patent, agreement, or lease a condition requiring the inclusion of the land in any irrigation project formed or to be formed by the Territorial agency responsible therefor and making the land subject to assessments made or to be made for such irrigation project, which assessments shall be a first charge against the land. For failure to pay the assessments or other breach of the condition the land may be forfeited and sold pursuant to the provisions of this act, and, when sold, so much of the proceeds of sale as are necessary therefor may be used to pay any unpaid assessments."

"Sec. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval."

"Sec. 2. In the event the public lands in the Territory are returned to the sole jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii, the amendment of section 73, paragraph (i), of the Hawaiian Organic Act requested of the Congress in section 1 hereof shall become effective forthwith.

"Sec. 3. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

*"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."*

#### "Joint Resolution 21

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress to enact legislation enabling Hawaii to be admitted to statehood

"Whereas Hawaii was annexed to the United States by agreement between the government of the people of Hawaii, which was then an independent Republic, and the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas under said agreement Hawaii was to become, and did become, an integral part of the United States; and

"Whereas in fulfillment of the terms of the Newlands resolution of annexation the Congress enacted the Hawaiian Organic Act, which constituted Hawaii an incorporated organized territory; and

"Whereas every incorporated organized territory in the history of the United States, except Alaska and Hawaii, has invariably been granted statehood upon the successful completion of a reasonable period of pupillage; and

"Whereas inherent in the public acts under which Hawaii became an integral part of the United States and was created an incorporated organized territory; was the implied promise of ultimate statehood on an equal footing with the original States, upon the fulfillment of the traditional requirements for admission as a state established and followed in the admission of every previously incorporated organized territory; and

"Whereas this implied promise has been repeatedly acknowledged by the executive and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and by the Congress of the United States, especially in the reports of committees of the Congress duly adopted by the Congress relating to statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated their political maturity, their ability to govern themselves in accordance with the principles of representative government laid down by the United States Constitution, and their ability to maintain themselves as a sound economic unit; and have fully and unequivocally met every historic qualification for statehood; and

"Whereas in each Congress since 1946 Hawaii has moved ever closer to the attainment of its goal, to such effect that in the 83d Congress both the House of Representatives and the Senate enacted legislation for the admission of the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas title I of H. R. 2535 of the 84th Congress, as recommended to be amended by Report No. 88 of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, constitutes a considered disposition of every matter involved in the admission of the new state; is the result of many years of study, hearings, and reconciliation of all points of view; and provides the proper framework for the admission of Hawaii to statehood: Now, therefore,

*"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:*

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation enabling Hawaii to be admitted to statehood, substantially in the form of title I of H. R. 2535, as recommended to be amended by Report No. 88 of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress.

"Sec. 2. This legislature does hereby reaffirm the desire and will of the people of Hawaii that statehood be granted them, and does hereby reassert that fulfillment of the rights of the people of Hawaii calls for enactment of enabling legislation without further delay.

"Sec. 3. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker

of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the said Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said House of Representatives, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,  
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact into law H. R. 588 entitled 'A bill to establish an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II, or the Korean service period in combat, or from an instrumentality of war' introduced by Mr. OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress on January 5, 1955

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, in its devotion and loyalty to the United States of America, has given unselfishly of its men to the service of the Armed Forces of the United States of America during World War II and the Korean emergency; and

"Whereas the fortunes of war have seen fit to take the lives of many of these men who left their children behind them; and

"Whereas it is not only fitting, but proper, that we, whom they so loyally served and for whom they made the greatest of all sacrifices, effectuate some expression of our gratitude; and

"Whereas it is felt that such gratitude could be best expressed, among others, by providing opportunities for education and training to children whose education and training would otherwise be impeded or interrupted by reason of the death of their fathers as a direct result of their services in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for aiding such children in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the death of their fathers; and

"Whereas such a program would be of benefit to the children of these men of the Territory of Hawaii as well as of the Nation; and

"Whereas H. R. 588, should be enacted into law, best expresses the intent and purposes herein expressed: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact into law H. R. 588 entitled 'A bill to establish an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in the line of duty during World War II, or the Korean service period in combat, or from an instrumentality of war' introduced by Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, during the 1st session of the 84th Congress on January 5, 1955.

"Sec. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 10th day of May A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,  
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 46

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to increase the immigration quotas applicable to the peoples of the Pacific and Asiatic areas

"Whereas the United States of America remains a symbol of liberty and a haven for the oppressed to the peoples of the East as well as those of the West; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by its enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, allotted immigration quotas for the nations in the Pacific and Asiatic areas; and

"Whereas these immigration quotas, although substantially more liberal than those of the past, still are not adequate to admit the many able persons in the Pacific and the Far East who wish to immigrate to our country and can contribute to the strength and prosperity of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to consider favorably the increasing of the annual immigration quotas applicable to the peoples of the Pacific and Asiatic areas, particularly those who are located in the area referred to as the Asia-Pacific triangle; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

KANSAS WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAMS — RESOLUTION OF COMMISSIONERS OF LAWRENCE, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the mayor and city commissioners of the city of Lawrence, Kans., which I have received from Mayor John P. Crown, petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the construction of projects as recommended and authorized by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the construction of projects as recommended and authorized by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation

Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Kansas; and

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought, but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and

droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

Whereas many cities, industries, and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

Whereas the Federal Government, through acts of Congress, has delegated to three agencies—namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture—the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation, pollution control, and soil conservation: Be it

Resolved by the Mayor and Commissioners of the City of Lawrence, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions necessary to assure continuous surveys and planning and the early completion of all recommended and authorized projects in the State of Kansas by the three agencies—namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk of the city of Lawrence be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to Mr. Emil Heck for transmittal to Senators SCHOEPPEL and CARLSON; Representative SCRIVNER; CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and Chairman RILEY, of the Missouri-Arkansas Basin Subcommittee.

JOHN P. CROWN,  
Mayor.  
H. C. FISHER,  
City Clerk.

DEVELOPMENT OF DAM SITES BY PRIVATE UTILITIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Nodak Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., relating to the development of dam sites by private utilities.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it appears that the private utilities are attempting to scuttle plans for development of several of the great remaining all-purpose dam sites in the United States; and

Whereas it is our belief that these sites should be considered as natural resources belonging to all of the people of the country; and

Whereas it appears that development of these resources is vital to the defense and production capacity of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our national association be encouraged to vigorously campaign for the best possible development of these great natural resources, and that our Senators and Congressmen and the Secretary of the Interior be informed of the attitude of our group in this matter.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask



unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Post 1755, the American Legion, New York, N. Y., favoring a strong, permanent American merchant marine.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RESOLUTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT, JR., POST 1755, THE AMERICAN LEGION, NEW YORK, N. Y., ON UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY**

Whereas the American Legion has for over 35 years supported a strong, effective, and modern American merchant marine, and repeatedly urged the Congress of the United States to enact policies to develop and maintain such a merchant marine, including an effective program of officer training; and

Whereas there have been introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 595, H. R. 3088, H. R. 3318, and in the Senate S. 967, providing for the maintenance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Post, No. 1775, urges the Congress of the United States to enact the aforesaid legislation, which will insure permanently for the American merchant marine the well-trained officers which it needs.

HUGH J. CASEY,

Major General, U. S. A. (Retired),  
Post Commander.

#### INVESTIGATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to an investigation of the State Department concerning its administration of the Refugee Relief Act. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

Whereas the recent dismissal of a high official from the State Department of the United States has created throughout the country varied expressions of dissatisfaction in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to make a complete and thorough investigation relative to the operation and administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by the State Department of the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to the presiding officer of both branches of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

#### FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1955—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the West Texas-New Mexico Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association, favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1644) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RESOLUTION OF WEST TEXAS-NEW MEXICO CHAPTER, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION**

Whereas the Federal Construction Act of 1955, S. 1644, has been introduced and been read twice, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

Whereas it is the desire of the electrical industry to act in the interest of the public, to protect unjust expenditures of public funds, and help the public receive full value for their construction dollar; and

Whereas it is the earnest desire of the electrical industry to produce the most qualified mechanical work possible, and give recognition when quality is attained: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the West Texas-New Mexico Chapter NECA, go on record as favoring passage of the Federal Construction Act of 1955, and to convey this information to the committee and request a speedy passage of this bill.

GLENN O. BROWN,

President.

ATKIN COOK,

Board of Governors.

EDWARD STROUT,

Secretary-Manager.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a series of resolutions adopted at the 24th annual meeting of stockholders of Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

##### "DAIRY PROGRAM

"Whereas farm price-support programs have been developed for all major farm crops but dairy products; and

"Whereas the Farmers Union believes that dairy products are essential for the health and welfare of our increasing population; and

"Whereas the sale of dairy products constitutes the major farm income of the dairy States: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the delegates of the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, go on record that dairy products be included as a basic commodity to be supported along the lines of the program adopted by the National Dairy Producers Conference held at Madison, Wis., on January 23, 1954.

##### "FAMILY FARM POLICY

"Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin (H. R. 2000) and sponsored in the Senate by Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and MURRAY, of Montana, entitled the "Family Farm Policy Act," which sets forth the family farmers bill of rights as a guide and standard for farm legislation and agricultural policy. This bill of rights embodies and enumerates the principles of the family-size farm and security, opportunity, and parity of living for farm families: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we the delegates in attendance at this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange go on record in support of the principles of this legislation.

##### "FARM PROGRAM

"As a wholesale supply cooperative serving the needs of farmers in a six-State area, the Farmers Union Central Exchange performs a vital function in the overall Farmers Union movement.

"It has the endeavor and purpose in common with the other Farmers Union cooperatives and the National and State Farmers Union educational organizations to preserve the family-type farm for our United States of America, and to secure parity of income and living standards for farm families. This is not just a high-sounding phrase.

"The kind of farm program which individuals and organizations develop and support depends on their basic philosophy and purpose. Parity for farmers is not and should not be a matter of partisan politics, but politicians and political parties must be held accountable for their record.

"We condemn the 1954 Farm Act because it is in conflict with the goal and past accomplishments to achieve parity for agriculture. It seeks to regulate production by manipulating prices and to eliminate surpluses by eliminating farmers.

"When production control becomes necessary, it should be by democratic farmer participation in control programs, not by application of a protracted economic squeeze ending in bankruptcy and foreclosure.

"Our State Department has found in a number of foreign countries that monopoly and large-scale land ownership resulted in conditions favorable to Communist expansion. In order to prevent such expansion, our Government has assisted these countries in land reform programs to replace land monopoly with individual family-owned and operated farms. However, the leading proponent and architect of these land reforms for foreign farmers was dismissed by our Secretary of Agriculture as a security risk.

"And our present program for American farmers is leading toward, not away, from land monopoly.

"We recognize that farming operations must keep pace with modern technology and know-how. And that measures for so-called rural sium clearance are necessary. Such measures, however, are a supplement, not a substitute, for price supports. Those who say that we cannot achieve parity of income for farmers lack faith in our free-enterprise system and our democratic way of life.

"The present administration has promised to develop new farm programs to secure full parity for farm products, both storable and perishable. It has not yet succeeded in doing so, and until it does, we urge that the 1954 Farm Act be repealed and that the 90-percent supports under the old parity formula be restored for basic commodities; that acreage allotments and marketing quotas be utilized to achieve a better balance between supply and demand.

**"RURAL ELECTRIFICATION**

"The management of rural electric cooperatives by the farmers and rural people of the United States, has proven to be a success, by the repayment of loans, together with interest on schedule, or in advance, where ample wholesale power has been available at reasonable rates. In order to continue this most excellent record, and thereby also to more securely safeguard the interests of the United States Treasury in these REA loans, it becomes necessary:

"1. That an ample supply of power be available at all times;

"2. That the preference clause, as embodied in the Flood Control Act of 1944, be not discarded;

"3. That the Power Marketing Criteria of 1954 as announced by the Department of the Interior be better clarified; and

"4. That rates for electric energy from multipurpose dam installations be not increased above present rates. Especially is this true in the Missouri River Basin, where the feasibility of all REA loans was based on cheap hydroelectric power and where the load growth of these rural electric cooperatives has been such that they will be facing a critical power shortage within a couple of years.

"In order to alleviate this shortage of power and also to serve the best interests of all consumers of electric energy in the basin, public development of these installations must be continued until the maximum amount of firm power, which can be economically produced, has been reached.

"Since the maximum amount of firm power which could be produced can readily be sold at a much higher rate than dump power, giving a greater return to the Federal Treasury for the installations made in the basin, and since an abundance of fuel is available in the basin which, if developed, could produce an enormous amount of low-cost electric energy: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., February 28 through March 3, 1955, do recommend that the Congress of the United States authorize the construction of fuel-powered generating facilities in the Missouri Basin to firm up and support the hydrogenerating capacity of these installations; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the congressional delegations in the area served by the Farmers Union Central Exchange."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

**"RURAL TELEPHONE**

"We favor expansion of rural telephone service and urge the Congress of the United States to provide funds for an adequate rural telephone loan program.

**"NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

"Through the development of our natural resources, many benefits have been brought to the people of the United States, such as the generation of electric power, irrigation, flood control, navigation, recreation, and wildlife and soil conservation. These hydroelectric generating facilities have brought to our people, through the rural electric cooperatives, electric power that would otherwise have never been available. Therefore we recommend that the Congress of the United States continue to appropriate funds for the development of such other natural power resources of this country, including Hells Canyon Dam in Idaho and the power and navigation development of the St. Lawrence River in cooperation with Canada."

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

**"PUBLIC POWER AND PRIVATE UTILITIES**

"Whereas the present policy of the administration in regard to private utilities and power development is:

"1. To turn over to private utilities much of the Nation's public power construction

and output, contrary to customary and legally established preference policies.

"2. To permit a type of power construction by private utilities which will bring about the creeping destruction of multipurpose river development.

"3. To compel electric cooperatives through so-called partnership agreements to consent to the expansion of private power while public power projects are being halted.

"4. To subsidize private utilities by guaranteed profits and by various devices such as are contained in the Dixon-Yates contract: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., on February 28 through March 3 do hereby go on record as fully endorsing the valiant efforts of the State and National Farmers Union leadership to block the private power policies of the present administration."

To the Committee on Public Works:

**"DIXON-YATES CONTRACT**

"Whereas the administration has seen fit to promote a contract authorizing the private power combine, Dixon-Yates, to provide electric power to TVA for use by Atomic Energy Commission; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower ordered this contract signed over the disapproval of both the Chairman of TVA, and the Chairman of AEC; and

"Whereas the Dixon-Yates group was awarded the contract in spite of lower bids from other private groups, and in spite of the fact that TVA maintains that it could build steam generators and transmit electricity to AEC at a lower cost than private utilities; and

"Whereas the administration has refused to present all facts to answer the charges of preferential treatment: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That inasmuch as the administration's conduct in the Dixon-Yates case raised many unanswered questions and inasmuch as there are no apparent reasons justifying such a power contract, the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, do hereby go on record calling upon Congress to conduct a thorough investigation of the Dixon-Yates controversy by the proper investigating committee."

**FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1955—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE**

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes—the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1955—and I submit a report (No. 350) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as reported, show the names of the additional sponsors who have requested that their names be included with those of the author of the bill. The sponsors are the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without

objection, the request of the Senator from New Mexico is agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that permission be given to members of the committee who may have differing views to present their views at the proper time, which I believe will be at the end of next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS AND REPORTS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE**

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency, for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Originally, this concurrent resolution called for the reprinting of 2,500 additional copies of 14 hearings held before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and 3,000 additional copies of three reports made to the Senate on the same subject.

As amended by the Committee on Rules and Administration, however, the authorization to print the hearings has been stricken and the concurrent resolution now calls for the reprinting of the reports only.

The estimated cost of printing these reports will be \$1,592.29. The cost to reprint the reports and the hearings would have totaled \$19,348.28.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not like to object to the Senator's request, but at the moment I must object, until I have had an opportunity to discuss the subject. I believe that, after consultation between the majority leader and the minority leader, consideration of the concurrent resolution can be obtained during the afternoon. I object to its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, and there is no objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain



hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER, on May 2, 1955, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, in line 3, after the word "Judiciary," to strike out "not more than 2,500 additional copies each of 14 hearings held before a subcommittee of the said committee, and", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 3,000 additional copies each of three reports of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.*

The amendment was agreed to.  
The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), as amended, was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,  
The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPEL (by request):

S. 1960. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend water-carrier certificates and permits under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1961. A bill to provide for the conveyance of part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Colchester, Vt., to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1962. A bill for the relief of Teofilo Medina, of Alcalde, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 1963. A bill to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain flood-control projects by local interests; and

S. 1964. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, as amended, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters so as to change the method by which the apportionment of total cost is made; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 1965. A bill to repeal a particular contractual requirement with respect to the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1966. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of documents evidencing the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1967. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1968. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1969. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax on electric flatirons and electric ironers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. BARKLEY):

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Kim Bok-soon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1971. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ritchie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1972. A bill for the relief of William Theodore and Emily Sansur Saad; and

S. 1973. A bill for the relief of Toufic N. Jildeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1974. A bill for the relief of Rosa Birger; and

S. 1975. A bill for the relief of Jenny Antoinette V. Ingram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1976. A bill to authorize the payment by the Government of medical expenses of persons contracting poliomyelitis subsequent to receiving vaccinations for the prevention of that disease; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1977. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Congressional Medal of Honor to John C. Reynolds; and

S. 1978. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to John C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Helene Schlegel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1980. A bill to amend section 708 of Public Law 690 of the 83d Congress, 2d session (the Agriculture Act of 1954); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### CONDEMNATION OF DISREGARD BY SOVIET UNION OF PLEDGES TOWARD LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 99), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Soviet Union has completely extinguished the freedom and independence

which were achieved for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia at the end of World War I by the vigorous efforts on the part of the United States; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has forcibly incorporated the territory of these nations into the Soviet Union in clear violation of the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate hereby expresses its condemnation of the willful disregard by the Soviet Union of its pledges, fundamental human rights, and the principle of self-determination, and requests the President to use every peaceful means at the disposal by reason of his office to keep these violations constantly before the attention of all the world.

#### PROPOSED WORK HOURS ACT OF 1955—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 25, 1955, I introduced a bill (S. 1204) to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to amend the so-called 8-hour laws.

The cosponsors of the bill are the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I now ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be added to the list of cosponsors, and I also ask that his name be added at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STATEMENTS OF SENATORS ON 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 42)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements made by Members of the Senate on the 20th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Addresses on American foreign policy delivered by him on May 12, 1955, before convention of Tax Executives Institute, Inc., in New York City.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Scrap Export Impasse Seen Aiding Russia," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on Wednesday, April 13, 1953.

# NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF SANTOS BUXO, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico, for a term of 4 years, vice Donald A. Draughon, term expired, to file with the committee in writing on or before Friday, May 20, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

# NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF WILLIAM B. HERLANDS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the nomination of William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Edward A. Conger, retired, to file with the committee in writing on or before Friday, May 20, 1955, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning this nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

# NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HOWARD F. VULTEE TO BE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to say that the Senate received today the nomination of Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations, vice Webster Bray Todd, resigned. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

# SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the seventh anniversary of the creation of the State of Israel, which will take place tomorrow, the 14th of May. It is appropriate for this occasion to recall the gallant deeds, in the face of untold hardship and adversity, which brought to fruition the establishment of this democratic nation. At the same time, I am proud to pay

tribute to the great achievements of the people of Israel during the past 7 years.

It is indeed unfortunate that strife and struggle have not yet been eliminated in the Middle East, an area so important to the future welfare of the free world. It devolves upon the United States to continue every effort, through the State Department and through the United Nations, to seek the establishment of a peaceful settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

On this anniversary, I am pleased to join in reaffirming the strong bonds of friendship between the United States and Israel, and to express every belief in the future progress and accomplishment of the newest democracy in the Middle East.

# POWER FROM HOOVER DAM TO BE REDUCED BY 30 PERCENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the debate on the upper Colorado River storage legislation, I urged that it constituted a hazard to the water rights of the people of California. Now comes a news story from Boulder City, Nev., which reads as follows:

A 30-percent reduction in power commitments from generating facilities at Lake Mead is expected to be announced here tomorrow by the Bureau of Reclamation because of the falling level of the lake.

Wade Taylor, acting regional director, said the Bureau's action would be based on a semiofficial survey of water storage behind Hoover Dam. Letters will be sent to power company customers in Nevada, Arizona, and California notifying them that only 70 percent of the normal power load will be available after June 1, Taylor said.

Power contracts for the new fiscal year will be signed June 1. Last year contracts called for a 15-percent cutback in power commitments.

Southern California Edison Co. and the Los Angeles Water & Power Department buy power from Federal generating facilities, but both have other generating facilities.

The lake level has reached its lowest point since the dam was built more than 20 years ago.

I read that into the RECORD, Mr. President, because I want to indicate to my colleagues that I did not speak in jest, or lightly, during the recent debate on S. 500.

# PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S CANDIDACY IN THE 1956 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of this morning, Friday, May 13, I noted in the column of Mr. Arthur Krock, a good friend of mine and a distinguished columnist, a statement which I wish to correct immediately. In discussing the possibility of President Eisenhower running again in 1956, Mr. Krock said:

But this was before Senator SMITH of New Jersey stressed his belief that the President's abiding hope is for retirement at the end of his term; Senator SMITH of Maine urged the Republicans to be prepared with the best vote getter after Eisenhower, and Roy A. Roberts predicted that only the unmistakable call of duty will induce the President to run for a second term—all in 1 day's span. To politicians the meaning of this is, "They know something."

It was last January that I made the statement to a meeting of our New Jersey Republicans that, in my judgment, President Eisenhower would run again and would be reelected, and that I would do all in my power between now and the national convention to aid in developing a New Jersey delegation to the convention in San Francisco unanimously pledged to his renomination and to his reelection.

The reaction in New Jersey to my statement was spontaneous and overwhelming, and was echoed by others. The result has been that all 21 Republican county committees in the State have unanimously adopted and forwarded resolutions to the White House indicating support of President Eisenhower as the Republican candidate in 1956.

It is my firm belief that the President will run again and will win. The constructive program which he has offered the country not only on the homefront, but especially in our foreign relations, makes his continued leadership in the years ahead vitally important.

The people of the United States will follow his leadership in 1956, as they did in 1952, and I am confident that he will be reelected next year by a majority as large as that he received 3 years ago.

# TRIBUTE TO JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. President, all of us are rejoicing over the news today that the Austrian treaty is about to be signed, if it has not already been signed. Its signing constitutes another tribute to the great ability of our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. At this time I shall not elaborate on that point; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Dulles' Accomplishments Prove the Value of His Travels," which was published this morning in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

# DULLES' ACCOMPLISHMENTS PROVE VALUE OF HIS TRAVELS

(By David Lawrence)

PARIS, May 12.—There is something very impressive and of incalculable value about the new-fashioned diplomacy which brings the Secretary of State of the United States to Paris for informal talks with the foreign ministers of France and Great Britain, as well as with the top men of other countries that comprise the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Critics may say the head of the State Department should not travel around but it is difficult to imagine how any progress could be made any other way in solving present-day problems among the allies.

Unfortunately, lots of mischievous rumors and some distorted reports reach back home to the parliaments and to the American Congress. It is not always easy to overcome the handicaps that interference, even by American legislators, sometimes brings. But if the Members of Congress who are so reckless with their comments on world affairs, especially the carping critics among the Democrats, could attend a press conference held here by the Secretary of State, they would come to realize how delicate and complicated are most of the questions tackled by the foreign ministers.



## THE INDOCHINA PROBLEM

This last week has seen many important conferences, but they are not unlike several meetings held here before. They are all significant. The modern way is for the top representatives of the allies to sit down together and thresh out their differences behind closed doors. They talk frankly and at times heatedly, but they come out of it as a rule with a clear understanding of the viewpoint of their respective countries.

Perhaps the most ticklish of all the questions this week was the problem of Indochina. Neither the French nor the American Government could afford to place itself in the position of trying to settle the internal affairs of South Viet-Nam, as this would only intensify Communist propaganda there. But certain parallel or common policies were agreed upon which may help to bring stability to the situation in the southern part of Indochina. For, although the desire is to see some form of democratic government chosen, it is not easy to establish at once an electoral machinery such as exists in a European parliamentary system. But out of the turbulence of these last few weeks may come a representative system for South Viet-Nam, and that is the objective now.

Despite the newspaper reports about a grave crisis in the relations between France and the United States over the Indochina question, it is a fact that both Governments recognized all along how important it is to reach an understanding and not to allow the Indochina dispute to impair their working arrangements on many other questions of far greater importance to both.

The American people can rest assured that Secretary Dulles handled himself very creditably here. Notwithstanding some garbled impressions that came to certain Senators, there was no mistake made here by Mr. Dulles in talking firmly where firmness was necessary. Those who heard his reply, for example, in the North Atlantic council meeting to Foreign Secretary Spaak, of Belgium, on the Formosa question said it was an excellent rebuttal to a statement that completely misconstrued the American position.

## NOT STAMPED

Nor is Mr. Dulles stampeded or pushed around by the Soviet tactics. He was clear-cut in his announcement here that he wouldn't go to Vienna until the Austrian treaty provisions had been finally set down on paper ready for signing. He is equally determined not to become involved in a protracted discussion in Vienna about the details of the forthcoming four-power conference.

There is a restraint and a forbearance about Mr. Dulles' manner in these top-level negotiations, and at the same time such an earnest reflection by him of the truly American viewpoint in international affairs that the American people can well be proud of their itinerant Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to say to my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, that I believe in optimism, and I wish to congratulate him on being optimistic. However, there are several ways of getting retired, and one of them is to be defeated for office. Sometimes when one runs for office, the people themselves do the retiring.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in reply, I still stand on the statement I made a few moments ago.

## THE SOVIET PROPOSALS FOR DISARMAMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 11, the Soviet Union proposed three United Nations resolutions in order to retain the initiative in carrying out the Soviet's long-term policies.

I believe that when the veneer of propaganda is removed, and when the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and to obstruct, rather than to clarify and expedite, is taken into consideration, it will be found that the Soviet proposal is a fraud.

The Soviets' so-called disarmament proposal would, first, destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world, as related to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world in the way that they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information as the press, radio, speech, and public discussion, of course they have nothing to lose by having their proposal adopted.

Second, the Communists claim a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements, both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea, there is still a divided country, despite the pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that Korea would be united and free. In the case of Viet-Nam, the Geneva conference turned over half the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a "successful" conference.

Even today, Mr. President, as we are meeting here, the city of Haiphong is, under the terms of the Geneva conference, being turned over to the Communists. An estimated 1 million free Vietnamese tried to get out of northern Viet-Nam prior to the delivery of Haiphong to the Communists, but were obstructed from doing so. Many of them are of the Catholic faith. They were obstructed by the Communists; and the latest press reports indicate that the Communist forces of Ho Chi Minh have now demanded that all citizens of Haiphong who cooperated in any way with the free world or with the French or with the United States, immediately turn themselves in at the various police stations.

Third, the Soviet proposals provide for the immediate withdrawal of the United States forces in Germany across the Atlantic Ocean, to the United States, a distance of approximately 3,600 miles, whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement—and if the Soviets do live up to it, it will be the first time in a quarter of a century the Soviets have done so—their forces would be only approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would also contemplate, at first, at least, two Germanys—in the same way that Korea and Viet-Nam are now divided—each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Ger-

many from the Western NATO Defense Alliance.

Fourth, our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a requisite for discontinuing the arms race. We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

Fifth, our industrial and scientific atomic know-how would be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

Sixth, the Communist proposal would, in my judgment, ultimately lead to yielding to the Chinese Communists' demand for Quemoy, the Matsus, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, and the removal of the provocative 7th Fleet from the Far East—all of which contribute, in Communist eyes, to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

Seventh, the Communists' proposal would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

Eighth, under the Communist proposal, all the above-mentioned steps would be taken prior to getting down to the problem of an effective disarmament, with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations "agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954." That is what Mr. Malik has proposed.

Mr. President, since the free world's forces as of that date are known, and since the Communists' forces are not known, such a proposal would establish as the starting point for future moves a topheavy Communist base. In the free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations are subject to debate and vote in Parliament and Congress and can now be readily checked. In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely upon the Communists' "official figures" 1 month after the convention became effective.

Furthermore, unless and until Communist China becomes a "permanent member of the Security Council," the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Mr. President, since, without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon, Communist power could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this weapon and the testing of it would work to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5, wherein it is stated that "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces, the states assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

Mr. President, in the first phase of 1956, according to the Soviet proposal, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad, and are to return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic Ocean and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific Ocean, whereas the Soviet Union would pull back 600 miles, at the most.

Under the Soviet proposals, the production of all atomic weapons would

cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities is known, whereas the location of the Soviet installations is not known, and since no adequate inspection system is provided for, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

Mr. President, the second Assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals by the Government of the United States in the atomic and conventional weapon field are still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then provides for a limited type of inspection and control, similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since that system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, and under it the Chinese Communist and the North Korean forces have been able to add to their supply of war materials and build bases and bring in MIG fighter planes, all in contravention of the terms of the Korean armistice, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now proposes, in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection, an arrangement following the Korean armistice pattern.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the three resolutions proposed by Mr. Malik.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 12, 1955]

TEXT OF PEACE PROPOSAL OFFERED BY SOVIET UNION TO THE U. N.

FIRST ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

The General Assembly, aware of the great responsibility which rests with the United Nations for the maintenance of peace among the nations, deems it its duty to draw the attention of all states to the situation that is developing now in the relations between countries.

The peoples who but recently lived through the Second World War, which took a huge toll of human lives and wrought immense material destruction, are more than ever before displaying a firm will for peace.

This deep-rooted desire of the peoples for peace has already made it possible to end the bloodshed in Korea and in Indochina and thereby create more favorable conditions for the settlement of other outstanding international issues.

At the same time the peoples are displaying legitimate concern for the destinies of the world, especially in view of the situation that is developing in Europe and in Asia.

This has been expressed specifically in the decisions of the recent Asian-African conference at Bandung, which is of great importance in the struggle for peace, for the freedom and independence of the nation.

The situation in certain areas of the world, far from improving, on the contrary is becoming complicated and mutual distrust among states is growing.

The absence of the necessary trust in relations between countries is the main cause hampering an adjustment of outstanding issues both in Europe and in Asia.

This above all applies to relations between the great powers, which bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of general peace and the security of the nations.

Cooperation found lacking

Notwithstanding the obligations assumed by the great powers, together with other states members of the United Nations, to

cooperate in the maintenance of peace and international security, the relations between them do not conform with these requirements.

Distrust in relations between the powers has brought about a situation in which, after the end of the Second World War, a threat of another war has arisen, a war still more horrible for its consequences.

As a result of this distrust, first and foremost in relations between the powers which are permanent members of the Security Council, the arms race is expanding all the time, the armies, navies, and air forces are being increased continuously.

The greatest achievements of science and engineering are utilized for the production of the most destructive means of annihilation of people.

Especially large is the scale of the arms race in the manufacture of such dangerous weapons as the atomic and hydrogen bombs.

Numerous foreign military bases are being set up on foreign territories, which aroused the legitimate apprehensions of the states in whose proximity these bases are being established. The establishment of such bases also increases the threat to the security of the states on whose territories they are being set up.

The existence of such bases, many of which are used for the atomic-war preparations conducted by certain powers, still more increases distrust in the relations between states and aggravates international tension.

Cold war cited

The result of all this is that the world has for many years been in the state of so-called cold war, while the burden of the military preparation of states is weighing down the peoples more heavily.

Notwithstanding the resolutions of the General Assembly, unanimously adopted as early as 1947, which condemned any form of propaganda designed or capable of creating or increasing a threat to peace, a breach of peace, or an act of aggression, open propaganda of another war is conducted in a number of states.

Calls for war, far from having been discontinued, are becoming more and more frequent in the press, over the radio, and in public statements. Moreover, calls for atomic war have become especially frequent of late.

The traditional economic and trade relations between many countries, which developed in the course of many years, have been deranged, with all the attendant negative consequences for international economic cooperation.

The situation which has arisen demands that urgent and effective measures be taken to ease international tension and to consolidate mutual trust in relations between states.

This object can be achieved only if the cold war is discontinued, if an end is put to the propaganda of another war conducted in certain countries and accompanied by the fomenting of enmity and hatred between nations and the setting of some peoples against other peoples.

Continuation of the propaganda which is being conducted in certain countries and is designed to whip up the war hysteria and calls for war can only aggravate international tension and heighten mutual distrust between states and thereby increase the threat of another world war.

On the other hand, discontinuation of the cold war between states could help to ease international tension, establish the necessary trust in international relations, avert the threat of another war, and create the conditions for a life of peace and tranquillity for the nations.

This, in turn, would create the requisites for the carrying out of a broad disarmament program and the institution of the

necessary international control over the implementation of this program.

For these purposes the General Assembly:

1. Recommends to all states to take the necessary measures for the strict implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly condemning any form of propaganda of a new war, for the discontinuation of all calls for war and for fomenting enmity among the nations voiced in the press, over the radio, in the cinema, and in public statements.

Noncompliance with this recommendation will be regarded as a violation by a state of its international duty and its obligation before the United Nations—to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force, not to violate the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

2. Notes with satisfaction the successes achieved in the negotiations on the Korean question between the states concerned, which brought about the end of the war in Korea, and also on the cessation of hostilities in Indochina. Thereby two dangerous seats of war in the Far East have been eliminated.

As a result of the negotiations between the states concerned it has become possible to settle also the question of concluding a state treaty with Austria, which insured the restoration of an independent Austria.

The settlement of the Austrian question represents another important contribution to the strengthening of peace in Europe and helps to create conditions for the successful adjustment of other outstanding post-war issues.

All this shows that by far not all the possibilities have been utilized for settling outstanding international questions through negotiations between the powers in the interests of peace, freedom, and the national independence of the peoples.

3. Holds that relaxation of international tension and establishment of the necessary talks between countries would be promoted by the immediate withdrawal by the four powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Britain, and France—of their occupation forces from the territory of Germany to their national frontiers, except strictly limited contingents of troops left temporarily on the territory of Germany pending the conclusion of an agreement on their full withdrawal.

These aims would also be facilitated by the establishment of strictly limited contingents of local police forces in both parts of Germany and the institution of joint controls by the four powers over the implementation of the restrictive agreement.

The General Assembly will welcome any other steps as may be taken by the four powers to withdraw their forces from the territory of Germany and also to facilitate a settlement of the German problem in the interests of European security and the national unification of Germany as an integral, peaceable, and democratic state.

4. Deems it necessary that the states which are permanent members of the Security Council reach agreement on the dismantling of military bases on foreign territories and inform the Security Council and the General Assembly of the results. Such an agreement would be of great importance for reducing international tension, removing distrust in international relations, and would facilitate the creation of the requisites for discontinuing the arms race.

5. Calls on the states which have experience in the production of atomic materials and atomic energy to render extensive production and scientific technical assistance to other countries in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, without making such assistance conditional upon any demands of a political or military nature.

6. Calls on the countries concerned to settle outstanding questions in the Far East in conformity with the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity as the existing tense



situation in certain areas of the Far East is fraught with the danger of another war and gravely menaces the maintenance of world peace.

7. Considers it necessary that states in their economic relations eliminate every discrimination which hampers the development of broad economic cooperation between them, first of all in the field of trade.

Both private and state interests are prejudiced by the situation when trade ties between countries which have existed for a long time are severed.

The elimination of such discrimination and the broad development of international ties, based on the principle of mutual advantage will strengthen friendly relations between countries and help raise the living standards of the peoples.

Without the elimination of these obstacles to the development of international trade it is impossible to expect real relief of international tension.

An important means for improving mutual understanding and bringing the peoples closer together is also the expansion of international cultural relations, specifically through the broad exchange of delegations and mutual visits by people engaged in industry, agriculture, trade, science, culture and the arts, delegations of students, and through the development of tourist travel.

8. Decides to include in the agenda of its regular session the question of compliance by states with the provisions of the present declaration, having in view that their implementation will conform to the desire of the peoples for peace, will facilitate the establishment of necessary trust between states and thereby will make it easier to carry out a broad disarmament program and to establish effective international control over the fulfillment of this program.

#### SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Regarding the conclusion of an international convention on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons:

The Security Council, striving to save mankind from another devastating war, to ease tension in relations between states, relieve the peoples from the heavy tax burdens they are bearing as the result of the continuing arms race.

Desiring of insuring the possibility of using the released resources to raise the living standard of the peoples and to render extensive assistance to the economically underdeveloped countries.

Instructs the United Nations Disarmament Commission to draw up and submit for approval in the Security Council a draft of an International Convention on Reduction of Armaments and Prohibition of Atomic, Hydrogen and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Such a convention, aimed at strengthening peace and international security, should envisage:

A. Complete prohibition of the use and manufacture of both nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction and the employment of the existing stocks of nuclear weapons for peaceful purposes;

B. Substantial reduction of all armed forces and all conventional armaments;

C. Establishment of a control agency with the right, powers and functions guaranteeing in relation to all states equally effective observance of the agreed prohibitions and reductions.

In conformity with this, the convention should contain the following basic principles pertaining to measures for reduction of conventional national armaments:

Prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction and the procedure for the implementation of these measures during two periods.

#### First-period measures to be carried out during 1956

The following measures shall be carried out during 1956:

1. The state signatories to the convention undertake, as the first step toward reduction of armaments and armed forces, not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954.

They also undertake not to increase their appropriations for the armed forces and armaments, including atomic weapons above the level of the expenses made for these purposes during the year which ended on September 31, 1954.

The aforesaid measures shall be carried out within 2 months after the corresponding agreement enters into force.

The United States, the U. S. S. R., China, Britain, and France shall submit to the Disarmament Commission, within 1 month after the convention enters into force, full official figures regarding their armed forces, conventional armaments, and expenditures for military needs.

2. An agreed level is fixed for which the armed forces of all states exceeding this level shall be reduced so that no state should possess armed forces which might present a serious threat to international peace.

The armed forces of the United States, the U. S. S. R., China, Britain, and France shall be reduced substantially. To this end the aforementioned five powers undertake to reduce the numerical strength of their armed forces so that they should not exceed the following levels:

The United States: From 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men.

The U. S. S. R.: From 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men.

China: From 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men.

Britain: 650,000 men.

France: 650,000 men.

The five powers undertake to reduce correspondingly their conventional armaments as well.

The aforesaid 5 powers reduce within 1 year their armed forces and armaments to the extent of 50 percent of the difference between the level of their armed forces and armaments on December 31, 1954, and the reduced levels of the armed forces and armaments of each of these states, fixed according to the obligations assumed by each state, as outlined above.

The appropriations of the states for the forces and conventional armaments are reduced accordingly.

3. To convene not later than during the first half of 1956 a world conference for general reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons, with the participation of state members of the United Nations and states which are not members of the United Nations with the object of determining the reduction of armaments and armed forces by other states and prohibition of atomic weapons.

That strength of the armed forces the other states will be allowed to maintain shall be in all cases considerably lower than the levels fixed for the five permanent members of the Security Council.

In fixing the reduction of armaments by states, including the permanent members of the Security Council, a count should be taken of simple agreed criteria, including demographic, geographic, economic, and political factors, having in view the strengthening of general peace and international security and the lessening of the threat of aggression.

4. As one of the first measures in carrying out the program of reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons, the states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons undertake to discontinue the tests of these weapons.

An international commission shall be established for supervising the fulfillment

of the aforesaid obligation by the states, and it shall submit reports to the Security Council and the General Assembly.

5. Simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of the armaments and the armed forces of the five powers by the first 50 percent of the agreed reduction to the established levels, the states, prior to the entry into force of the agreement on the complete prohibition of the atomic weapons, assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons which they consider as prohibited for themselves.

Exceptions from this rule may be allowed for purposes of defense against aggression when an appropriate decision is taken by the Security Council.

6. The states possessing military, naval, and airbases on the territories of other countries undertake to dismantle these bases.

The question as to what bases are to be dismantled during the first period should be additionally agreed upon.

The implementation of these measures should consolidate the necessary trust between states and make it easier to carry out the measures for reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons envisaged for the second period.

#### Second-period measures to be carried out during 1957

The following measures shall be carried out during 1957:

1. The production of atomic and hydrogen weapons shall be stopped immediately and national budget appropriations for military needs shall be cut correspondingly.

2. The United States, the U. S. S. R., China, Britain, and France shall reduce during the year their armed forces and armaments by the remaining 50 percent of the difference between the levels of the armed forces and armaments of each of the aforesaid five states on December 31, 1954, and the reduced levels of the armed forces and armaments of each of these states, fixed according to the obligations assumed by them under the convention.

These states shall reduce correspondingly their appropriations for the armed forces and conventional armaments.

Measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces of other states in the amounts fixed for them at the world conference are also completed during this period.

3. After the armed forces and conventional armaments are reduced by 75 percent of the total reduction envisaged by the convention even for defense, complete prohibition of the use of atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons of mass destruction will enter into force. Removal of these weapons from national armaments and their destruction, reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments by the remaining 25 percent of the agreed reduction shall begin simultaneously.

Both these processes shall be completed within definite time limits in 1957. All atomic material will then be used solely for peaceful purposes.

The states shall undertake to promote broad international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This cooperation will also cover the free exchange of information on the employment of atomic energy in industry, agriculture, medicine, and other fields of economy and science. Special attention should be given to the rendering of assistance to economically underdeveloped countries.

Such assistance should not be made conditional upon any demands of a political or military nature.

The states shall strive to devote part of the savings resulting from disarmament on a world scale and the removal of nuclear weapons to the broad utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

4. Measures for dismantling all foreign military naval and air bases on the territories of other states shall be completed.

Upon the carrying out of all the aforementioned it is desirable that the powers further reduce the armaments and armed forces to levels absolutely essential for the maintenance of internal security and the fulfillment of their obligations under the United Nations Charter.

The question of the obligations of China, as one of the permanent members of the Security Council following from the convention on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons of mass destruction, should be examined with the participation of the People's Republic of China.

#### SECOND ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

Regarding international control over reduction of armaments and prohibitions of atomic weapons:

Recognizing the great importance of and the need for instituting effective international control over the fulfillment by States of their obligations under the convention on reduction of armaments and armed forces and prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons,

The General Assembly notes that at present the necessary conditions are lacking for the institution of such control as would enjoy the trust of all states and would fully conform to the requirements of international security.

It is impossible to ignore the fact that at present there is considerable international tension and distrust in relations between states. This is what explains the fact that in the existing situation of distrust between states all kinds of obstacles are raised, even to the mutual exchange of industrial, agricultural, scientific, cultural, and other delegations.

Such a situation makes difficult the reaching of agreement regarding the admission by states to their enterprises, particularly those engaged in war production, of foreign controllers who could inspect the enterprises.

In the existing situation, when many states display legitimate concern for their security, it is difficult to expect that these states would trustfully give other states access to their industrial and other resources which are of vital importance for their security.

Inasmuch as the necessary trust between states is now lacking, a situation may arise in which the adoption of a decision of international control will actually be reduced to a mere formality failing to achieve the purpose.

This is all the more inadmissible because in the present situation the greatest apprehensions of the peace-loving peoples are aroused by the existence of atomic and hydrogen weapons as regards which the institution of international control is especially difficult.

This danger follows from the very nature of atomic production. It is well known that the production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes can be utilized for the accumulation of stocks of explosive atomic materials and, moreover, in ever greater quantities.

This means that states having enterprises for the production of atomic energy are able, in violation of their respective agreements, to accumulate big quantities of explosive material for the production of atomic weapons.

The danger of such a situation becomes still more understandable if account is taken of the fact that, given the corresponding quantities of explosive atomic materials, the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen bombs as such is a matter fully feasible technically and can be organized on a wide scale.

Thus there are possibilities beyond the reach of international control for circumventing this control and organizing the secret manufacture of atomic and hydrogen

weapons, even if there is a formal agreement on international control.

Under such a situation the security of the state signatories to the international convention cannot be guaranteed insofar as the possibility would be open for the potential aggressor to stockpile atomic and hydrogen weapons for sudden atomic attack on peace-loving states.

Any agreement on the institution of international control, so far as there is no atmosphere of peace, can only lull the vigilance of the peoples.

It can create a false sense of security while in reality there will be the danger of manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons and hence the danger of a sudden attack and the unleashing of atomic war with all its horrible consequences for the peoples.

Account must also be taken of the fact that preparation for another war, the danger of which has been greatly aggravated by the emergence of atomic and hydrogen weapons, is inescapably associated with the need to concentrate at definite points large military formations with big quantities of conventional armaments: aircraft, guns, tanks, naval vessels and so forth.

Such a concentration of big contingents of ground armed forces, the Navy and Air Force and their transfer can be effected only through big junctions, ports and airfields. With the present military techniques the significance of such points for preparing aggressive war, far from declining, on the contrary rises.

In the event of a war breaking out, besides atomic and hydrogen weapons, for all their destructive power, armies of many millions and huge quantities of conventional armaments which are of decisive significance for the outcome of any big war would inevitably be drawn into military operation.

All this must be taken into account in deciding the question of instituting international control over the fulfillment by states of their obligation under the Convention on Reduction of Armaments and Prohibition of Atomic Weapons.

The question of establishment of international control and the rights and powers of the international control agency must thus be examined in close connection with the implementation of the aforesaid measures for reduction of international tension, consolidation of trust between states, and the carrying out of other measures as regards the reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

Proceeding from the above, the General Assembly constitutes an international control agency with the following rights and powers:

1. For the first period of carrying out the measures for reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons:

A. With the object of preventing sudden attack by one state on another state, the international control agency shall set up on the territories of all the respective states along reciprocal lines control posts in big ports, railway junctions, motor roads, and airdromes.

The task of these posts shall be to watch that there should be no dangerous concentrations of ground forces or of air and naval forces.

B. The international control agency shall have the right to demand from the states the necessary information on the implementation of the measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces.

C. The control agency shall have unhindered access to materials pertaining to national budget appropriations for military needs, including all decisions of legislative and executive bodies of states on this question.

The states shall submit periodically within the fixed dates information to the control agency on the implementation of the measures envisaged by the convention.

2. For the second period of implementing the measures on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons:

The implementation of measures envisaged in the above-mentioned declaration and of the measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces and for prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons envisaged for the first period will create the necessary atmosphere of trust between the states.

Thereby the appropriate conditions for extending the functions of the international control agency will be insured.

In these conditions the international control agency shall have the following rights and powers:

A. To exercise control, including inspection, on a permanent basis, on the scale necessary to insure the implementation of the above convention by all the states. The international control agency shall exercise these functions, enjoying also the right to demand from states the necessary information on the carrying out of measures for reduction of armament and armed forces.

Inspection shall be carried out by personnel selected on an international basis.

B. To have permanently in all countries signatories to the convention its staff of inspectors who, within the bounds of the control functions they exercise, would have unhindered access at any time to all objects of control.

With the object of preventing sudden attack by one state on another state the international control agency specifically shall have on the territory of respective states their reciprocal control posts in big ports, railway junctions, motor roads, and airdromes.

C. The control agency shall have unhindered access to materials pertaining to national budget appropriations for military needs, including all decisions of legislative and executive bodies of states in the question. The states shall submit periodically within the fixed dates information to the control agency on the implementation of the measures envisaged by the convention.

3. The control agency makes recommendation to the Security Council on measures of prevention and suppression as regards violators of the convention on reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons.

4. On the basis of the aforesaid principles the functions and powers of the permanent international control agency should be specified and a corresponding instruction given for this purpose.

The above proposal of the Soviet Government was submitted by the U. S. S. R. delegate, J. A. Malik, for consideration by the subcommittee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in London on May 10, 1955.

#### AUSTRIAN TREATY AND CLAIMS OF VICTIMS OF NAZI PERSECUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, 10 years have passed since the end of the Second World War. We are all aware of the tragic loss of life and health, of property and homes, and of the terrible persecutions to which millions were subjected by the brutal Nazi regimes. It was certainly the clear understanding of all our allies, and I believe it remains our firm policy, that the victims of Nazi persecution would be compensated in full by the responsible peoples. I am pleased to say that in Germany the reparation problem has been handled with some consideration for the equities involved, although much remains to be done. In Austria, however, I am sad to state, such has not been the case.



The failure to arrive at a satisfactory solution of this problem in Austria becomes particularly significant now that negotiations for an Austrian state treaty are about to be completed.

I received a letter concerning this problem from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc. I forwarded that communication with a letter of my own to Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State.

On May 10 I received the State Department's reply. I am pleased to see that the Department agrees with me as to "the wisdom of concluding a satisfactory agreement on the subject of these claims before the state treaty is presented to the Senate for ratification."

In this conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the correspondence to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 2, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I enclose for your information and comment a copy of a letter recently received from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc.

I know that the Department of State and the American Embassy in Vienna have viewed with great sympathy the claims of victims of Nazi action and have indicated their desire to see a speedy and just solution to the problem of claims of individuals and claims with respect to heirless property in Austria. It is my understanding that the Austrian Government, though it has not put forward the proposal referred to in the enclosed letter, has suggested a meeting in Vienna on May 9, at which time it apparently does propose to make its intentions known to the interested organizations, Jewish and non-Jewish.

I know that you will understand my interest in this matter. It would seem to me to be of substantial importance that satisfactory agreement on the subject of these claims be reached before the state treaty is presented to the Senate. Particularly is this so, since it is my understanding that events have long since outmoded that article of the draft treaty which deals with heirless property.

I anticipate that, in view of the discussions which are currently under way in Vienna, as reported in the public press, and in view of the imminent meeting on the claims of Nazi victims, developments will take place in the near future. I should greatly appreciate being informed of such progress as may be made.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF  
FORMER AUSTRIAN JURISTS, INC.,  
New York, April 19, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,  
Senator of the United States,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The undersigned association is composed of former Austrian attorneys, judges, civil servants, and other jurists. Besides on other tasks we are working on the indemnification of Austrian victims of Nazi oppression. We call your attention to the fact that Austria is reluctant to enact laws of indemnification. As a proof of this reluctance we stress the fact that Chancellor Raab on the occasion of his visit in Washington in December 1954 promised to propose drafts in this matter 2 weeks after his return to Vienna. We know also that the Department of State told Chancellor Raab that it wants

a prompt and satisfactory settlement of this issue.

Until now, however, about 4 months after Chancellor Raab's visit in Washington, not even a draft of legislation has been made. A settlement on a state treaty between Austria and the Soviet Union seems to be forthcoming.

We do not know either the contents of this settlement or the position which the three Western great powers intend to take concerning this settlement. We believe, however, that these three powers are eager to give Austria full independence. We fear that Austria will be more reluctant to enact the mentioned legislation after the conclusion of the state treaty. Therefore the Austrian victims are in great danger to lose their claims. It seems necessary that Austria be forced to enact satisfactory legislation on this matter before the state treaty is concluded, and that the United States Senate should not approve the state treaty before the enactment of the said legislation.

Besides we fear that Austria could repeal or impair the indemnification laws after getting full independence. To avoid any later change it seems to be necessary to insert in the state treaty a clause forbidding any such change.

As we know that you are a strong supporter of the claims for indemnification of the Nazi victims not only in words, but also in many acts we beg of you to use your influence with the Department of State and the Senate itself so that no state treaty with Austria should be concluded before a satisfactory legislation in the interest of the victims of Nazi oppression is enacted. If you should want further information and details we will be glad to furnish them.

Thank you very much.

Very sincerely yours,  
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF FORMER  
AUSTRIAN JURISTS, INC.,  
SIEGFRIED GEYERHAIN, Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, May 10, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have received your letter of May 2, 1955, which enclosed for information and comment a copy of a letter dated April 19, 1955, from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc.

As you indicate, the Department and the American Embassy in Vienna have viewed with sympathy the claims of victims of Nazi action and have expressed their desire to seek a speedy and just solution to the problem of claims of individuals and with respect to heirless property in Austria. I am pleased to confirm that the Austrian Government did propose a meeting in Vienna on May 9, 1955, at which time it is hoped that the Austrian Government will make its intentions known to the interested organizations. No information is yet available on the results of this meeting.

I am in complete agreement with you as to the wisdom of concluding a satisfactory agreement on the subject of these claims before the state treaty is presented to the Senate for ratification. This view has already been made known to the Austrian Government, both here and in Vienna, and I hope that it will contribute to progress toward a satisfactory agreement during the negotiations which are going on in Vienna between the Austrian Government and the Jewish organizations.

A copy of the letter from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc., is being transmitted to the American Embassy in Vienna for its information. As to the proposal made in the letter from the American Association of Former Austrian Jurists, Inc., to insert in the state treaty a clause forbidding any repeal or change of indemnification laws after Austria assumes

full independence, it seems unlikely that this could be achieved, even if it were proper and necessary, in view of the speed at which the treaty negotiations have been progressing. In any event, you may be assured that the Department and the American Embassy will continue to follow with the closest attention and sympathy the problem of a just settlement of the compensation claims of victims of Nazi action.

Sincerely yours,  
THURSTON B. MORTON,  
Assistant Secretary  
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Mr. LEHMAN. On May 9 of this year, the Austrian Government proposed to communicate its proposals with respect to the claims of Nazi victims to the interested organizations representing those victims. The meetings at which the proposals of the Austrian Government are being communicated are taking place at the same time as discussions are proceeding in Vienna on the long-awaited conclusion of a state treaty which would restore the independence and the sovereignty of Austria. It would be highly appropriate were these two sets of discussions to be linked and to be viewed as elements in the rectification of the injustices which arose out of the Nazi regime in Germany and subsequently in Austria.

Austria was itself a victim of Nazi action, though it must be said in all candor that the newspaper accounts of 1938 indicate that Hitler was joyously welcomed in Vienna by at least a substantial portion of the Austrian population. Nevertheless, it has been the object of allied policy over the years to restore Austria to that independence which she enjoyed before the events of March 1938 and to insure an Austrian Government which would represent the forces of democracy and of justice. From this objective the United States has never deviated, and Austrian independence has been postponed only because of the excessive demands and the interminable delays imposed by the Soviet Union. It would now seem that, for whatever reason, there is a possibility, though possibly at a very high price, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria may be achieved and the independence of that country restored.

It would be highly inappropriate, on the Austrian side, for the justifiable claims of victims of Nazi action to be forgotten at this moment. The ravages of Hitlerism did not fall with equal severity upon the population of Austria. Some elements of that population profited while others were despoiled and, in the case of Jewish victims, subjected to a systematic policy of mass extermination.

It will be in the interests of justice and equality in the international community, as well as in the interests of Austria itself, if a generous solution to these claims can be achieved simultaneously with or before the conclusion of the discussions with respect to a state treaty.

GENE SYMONDS OF THE UNITED PRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the news wires this morning relate another story of Communist brutality.

Early today, Gene Symonds, United Press manager for Southeast Asia, died in Singapore following a savage beating by Chinese Communists. It was a senseless, callous act of the kind that has made the word "Communist" hated throughout the world.

In a very real sense, Symonds died in the line of duty—just as a soldier on the battlefield. He was in Singapore for one reason, and one reason only—to gather facts for the information of the American public.

Symonds was typical of America's foreign correspondents to whom we owe so much. He achieved distinction covering the Korean war from the Pusan beachhead almost to the Yalu River itself. Time after time, he risked his life to cover the news.

I have always felt that one of our first lines of defense against communism is our free press. The American people have the facts upon which they can make their decisions because men like Symonds are stationed in the far-flung outposts of the world.

Day after day they search for the news—fearless and unafraid. And day after day they report the news—keeping our people alert to the realities of our times.

World communism has many deeds—many acts—to its discredit. Some day it will be called to account and among the indictments this stupid act of brutality will loom large.

#### DOCTRINES OF BIGOTRY AND HATE—ARTICLES BY JACK STEELE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on the great public service that has just been performed by the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance and its staff writer, Jack Steele. After a 2-month investigation, Mr. Steele wrote a series of 6 articles in the finest traditions of American journalism, exposing specifically named individuals and organizations who are again spreading the diseased doctrines of bigotry and hate.

It is shocking to realize that the bigots and hate-peddlers are again active in our country in their undercover efforts to sell their vicious ideas. Their activities have always been shameful to the vast majority of Americans who subscribe wholeheartedly to the American democratic faith.

The immense value of Mr. Steele's articles lies in the recognition that public knowledge of the facts about the enemies of our democracy is the best weapon to combat the evil ranting and raving of the bigots. The truth, Mr. President, will keep us free.

Mr. Steele describes graphically how the hawkers of hate are capitalizing on the genuine cold war fears over aggressive world communism, just as their predecessors did in the depression-born frustrations and war tensions of the 1930's, the heyday for hate in America.

These articles, published in this city last week by the Washington Daily News, identify the veterans and the newcomers active in the leadership of organized bigotry today, as well as the various mag-

azines, newsletters, pamphlets and other publications they distribute.

They constitute a ready reference, warning all Americans that the war for freedom is never finally won, and that we must remain eternally vigilant to protect our liberties and our honor. Only by knowing who among us is disloyal to our sacred beliefs can we be forewarned and better able to combat these insane attacks on American citizens because of race, color, or religion, even though they are promoted under the false guise of fighting against communism.

Though we necessarily devote our major efforts to defeating the menace of communism, we must not close our eyes to other totalitarian threats which seek innocent scapegoats in religious or racial minorities for the real or imagined ills of today's troubled world.

We preserve and protect our cherished and hard-won rights only so long as we preserve and protect them for all Americans.

#### THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after long hearings and careful consideration, the Senate Public Works Committee has reported S. 1048, a Federal-aid highway bill. This 5-year bill is the first installment of a vigorous program to bring all of America's Federal-aid highways to a point where they can meet the needs of national defense and of the national economy.

Highway construction is expensive. Highways cost money. Roads cannot be built without cost. The bill reported by the committee faces this issue squarely.

In the committee bill, there is no pretense that bonds issued by the United States Government do not constitute debt. There is no contention that we can build a vast system of Federal highways with Federal funds without spending Federal money. I commend the committee for reporting a forthright bill.

Our national traffic pattern is complex. It spreads from coast to coast, from border to border. Moreover, it is growing by leaps and bounds. Few, if any, communities in America are without their traffic problems.

The committee bill seeks to bring about improvement or reconstruction of all types of Federal-aid highways. It does not propose that all additional Federal funds for a long and indefinite period of time be spent on merely one category of roads that carry only a small fraction of our traffic. It does not discriminate against the roads on which most of the people live and travel. I congratulate the committee for viewing our Nation's highway needs in whole, not piecemeal.

The committee bill seeks to preserve the rights and integrity of our various States and State highway departments. It continues the apportionment formula by which each State is assured its pro rata share. It continues the cooperative relationship between the various State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads.

This bill preserves congressional control over appropriations. Under its terms, as is the case now, Congress would consider each year the appropriation requests and needs, and act accordingly.

There would be no effort to take from the Congress its power of appropriation, perhaps its most effective, if not its greatest, constitutional power.

In brief, Mr. President, the committee bill seeks to improve and expand the system of cooperation between the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads. Through the years this system has proved highly satisfactory.

I believe the committee was wise in retaining this basic framework.

The committee has afforded ample time for the preparation of a majority report and minority views, together with any additional views which members of the committee may individually desire to submit. These reports are expected to be printed and available to the Senate not later than Friday of next week.

It will be my purpose to schedule this important bill for consideration in the Senate at the earliest possible moment, perhaps Friday, May 20, or Monday, May 23. It is one of the most important measures that will come before this Congress, and I hope that all Senators will be present for its consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, instead of a defeat, the road bill reported by the Senate Public Works Committee is one of the greatest tributes to the vision of President Eisenhower that has come in his entire administration.

It steps up regular primary, secondary, and urban road building by 30 percent over the current year which in turn last year we had stepped up by 48 percent. And, as for the interstate system, the special object of the Clay Committee, this bill increases that in 4 years to 8,000 times what it was 2 years ago.

To be sure the committee bill is only a 5-year authorization instead of 10 for interstate and a 30-year freeze on the other systems, but if anyone wants to make this a 10-year bill, he can offer an amendment. I would not object too much, although I can see some wisdom in doing what we can for 5 years and then taking a new look at our needs and our pocketbooks.

The committee bill is vastly changed from the original bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The committee adopted many, many amendments. One which I offered will permit States to transfer their Federal-aid allocations between systems up to 20 percent, so they can tailor their programs to meet their special needs. We increased the funds for secondary roads because the interstate roads, which constitute really the cream of the primary system, are getting such a big boost. We put the national forest and national park roads on a 5-year program, too.

All in all, it is a good road program. It is weak on financing. That is primarily because the Constitution says revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. I think a provision to dedicate proceeds of a tax is a revenue measure. I proposed some



use fees but the proposal was not adopted. I also proposed an amendment to defer the effective date until revenue measures had been enacted in a constitutional way. That proposal was not agreed to. I shall probably renew that proposal on the Senate floor. I believe in pay-as-you-go financing as much as possible.

In any event, the committee bill is a victory for President Eisenhower's leadership. It is the biggest program we have ever attempted. It flows directly from his message to the governors and the Congress. It steps up the improvement and development of the country roads along with the turnpikes.

I am not much of a politician, but I see no sense in handing to the very shrewd statesman who is the Speaker of the House of Representatives the fat issue of rural roads to get the farmers out of the mud, versus big bond issues to build boulevards for the large cities and for truck transportation; certainly not when control of the next Congress rests in the Midwest, where a slipping farm income is the weakest sector of the administration front.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, one statement which intrigues me momentarily is that concerning country roads. What does the bill propose with reference to country roads; and what does the Senator mean by country roads?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I mean the secondary system, which has sometimes been described as the farm-to-market system.

Mr. THYE. Would such roads be on the township level or the county level?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would depend upon the laws of the State. There are, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota knows, because he was Governor of his State, several qualifications for highway aid, one for primary roads, one for secondary roads, and one for county roads. Secondary aid is what I am speaking of in connection with country roads.

Mr. THYE. Does the bill propose any changes within the Federal system?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not as to the allocations between the States. It continues the formula of the present law.

Mr. THYE. And within the States?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The States may, if they wish, match the secondary aid or apportion it to the counties or local units of government.

To answer the Senator's first question, last year the allocation for Federal secondary aid was in the neighborhood of \$47 million. We stepped it up last year, in the law which is effective this year, to \$210 million. This bill will step it up to \$300 million. That is a substantial percentage increase, but it does not begin to compare with the percentage increase proposed for primary roads.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to make some remarks in connection

with the statement of the Senator from South Dakota.

The committee, after many weeks of hearings—I think there were 21 full days of hearings—and after obtaining other information which would aid the committee in arriving at a conclusion with reference to a highway bill, reported the bill which the Senator from South Dakota has been discussing.

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that the 5-year proposition is better; and while it may be said that the bill is antagonistic to the program which was proposed, I assure the Senate that it is not. It will accelerate the construction of highways in the United States to the extent that is feasible at this time. The bill was not reported with the idea of ignoring the Clay report or of saying that it did not have merit, but the Clay report involved such an innovation that the committee felt it was better to go along in the way we have been proceeding since 1916, and in the meantime give the committee opportunity to gather more information with reference to the recommendations of the Clay report.

This bill was not arrived at after 2 or 3 days of hearings. It was after due deliberation by the Committee on Public Works, by members on both sides of the aisle, that the bill was reported. I, as chairman of the full committee, wish to thank Members on both sides. Even when there were differences of opinion, there was no question that we all agreed that it was necessary to accelerate the building of roads and to improve the interstate system, the farm-to-market roads, and the secondary roads.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Chair must advise the Senate that we are proceeding in the morning hour, with a 2-minute limitation on speeches.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may propound a question to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the Senator from New Mexico find the so-called Clay report and the President's recommendations most helpful?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Clay report did help in the deliberations of the committee, and some of the features suggested by the Clay report were included in the bill, but we did not think it was the proper time to experiment. The people of the United States are road conscious at this moment, and under the Clay report there would have to be a great deal of experimentation.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, while this is not the time to argue the question of the highway program, in view of the remarks on the subject which have been made during the morning hour, I believe the Senate should be apprised of the fact that a small minority of the Committee on Public Works will file minority views, and will, in due time, on the floor of the Senate, propose a substitute which will go the whole way in carrying out and

implementing the program of the President of the United States.

The bill coming from the committee, to be sure, is not the Gore bill; it is a bill which bears the imprints of the bold planning of the Clay report, which was prepared after careful consideration, and the bill itself is a partial implementing of the President's program.

The committee bill, however, does not provide for financing. It does not present a rounded-out program. It may be likened to a proposal which would have provided only in part for building the Panama Canal. The added business, the additional income and the stimulus to our revenues which would result from a national system of interstate highways are discounted and ignored by this part-way measure, and as a consequence, it is readily conceivable that there may be a continuation of the scattering of Federal funds without a definite and fixed purpose.

Therefore, although the bill reported by the committee, I repeat, is in no sense a rebuke to the administration or a defeat of the President's program, the Senate should fully realize that a determined effort will be made to present the full program to the United States Senate in due time.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE OF 26 MEMBERS OF THE WATTSVILLE MOTHERS CLUB OF LAURENS, S. C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that there are in the gallery today 26 ladies belonging to the Wattsville Mothers Club of Laurens, S. C. This group is under the direction and in charge of Miss Betty Richards, a daughter of a former Governor of South Carolina, one of the greatest governors my State has ever had. If there is no objection, I should like to have these ladies rise, so that Senators may greet them.

[The ladies rose from their seats in the gallery and were greeted with applause.]

#### THE CASE OF EDWARD CORSI

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 25, 1955, I brought to the attention of the Senate a letter dated April 12, 1955, that I addressed to Secretary of State Dulles relating to the strange case of Mr. Edward Corsi, who was removed from his position as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on Migration and Refugee Problems. A reply, dated April 28, 1955, is now in my hands. In view of the fact that it throws additional light on this case, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us briefly review the facts.

On December 30, 1954, the Secretary of State announced Mr. Corsi's appointment to this position. Mr. Corsi has published in the May 5, 1955, issue of the Reporter a telegram and letter received

by him from Mr. Dulles inviting him to accept appointment as a consultant "with responsibilities in the refugee field under the present Refugee Relief Act," and expressing gratification at Mr. Corsi's acceptance of the Secretary's "plea that you come down here to work for us." This correspondence does not even remotely suggest that Mr. Corsi's appointment was to be for only a 90-day period, and Mr. Corsi has stated that he was never given this impression in preappointment discussions. Indeed, Mr. Corsi states that Scott McLeod suggested that he buy a house in Washington.

On April 10, 1955, after 90 days' service in this position, Mr. Corsi's employment was terminated on the grounds that "under the Department's administrative regulations it was impossible initially to offer him a position for a longer period than 90 days." Mr. Dulles has also stated that no question of security was involved in this action.

But the administrative regulations in question are really the State Department's security regulations. They provide that no individual may be employed in a sensitive position within the Department unless a full field investigation has been conducted, with the following exception:

That in case of emergency a sensitive position may be filled for a period not to exceed 90 days by a person with respect to whom a full field preappointment investigation has not been completed if the Secretary of State finds that such action is necessary in the national interest.

It should be noted that these regulations do not say that an appointment may not be made for longer than the 90-day period, but only that the position may not be "filled" for longer than 90 days. This provision is the State Department's implementation of section 3 (b) of Executive Order No. 10450, which is cast in substantially identical language but uses the phrase "limited period" rather than "90 days." The obvious intended import of this provision is to permit emergency employment of individuals who have not been fully investigated, with the understanding that they would be subjected to a full field investigation during this period on the basis of which they would then be permitted to fill the position beyond the 90 days or limited period.

That the State Department has not generally interpreted its regulations as requiring it initially to offer positions for only a 90-day period in such circumstances is conclusively demonstrated in its admission in its letter to me of April 28, 1955, that the Department has made some appointments prior to completion of a full field investigation which have extended beyond the 90-day period.

The State Department tells me in its letter that it requested FBI investigation of Mr. Corsi on January 18, 82 days before the expiration of the 90-day period. Although the State Department usually conducts its own security investigations, its policy is to request FBI investigation for "high-ranking appointments." In addition, I am told that an FBI investigation was requested "because of the fact that unconfirmed information had come to the Department's attention

which required such action in consonance with Executive Order 10450." In other words, an FBI investigation was required under Executive Order 10450 because of the State Department's receipt of information relating to alleged subversive activities or interests of Mr. Corsi, or information indicating that he has allegedly been subject to coercion, influence, or pressure to act contrary to the interests of the national security.

I am informed by the State Department that it received the completed FBI investigative reports on March 29, 1955, or 13 days before expiration of the 90-day period, and that it received a letter from the Civil Service Commission dated April 5, 1955, or 5 days before the expiration of the 90-day period, advising that the FBI investigation had been completed. It is, perhaps, significant that it was not until April 5, 5 working days after receipt of the investigative reports, that the first mention was made of the 90-day appointment.

The point I am now trying to stress is that a lame-duck, weak excuse of a 90-day period was used as the means to dismiss Mr. Corsi, an excuse which had no relationship whatsoever, I may say, to the appointment which had been offered to Mr. Corsi, or to the field investigation and the subsequent appointment which could have been his.

But the important fact is this: The full field investigation was in fact completed within the 90-day period. Any legal impediment to Mr. Corsi's continued employment which may have existed because of tortured interpretation of the Department's regulations has been removed. There was no conceivable legal reason, even if Mr. Dulles chose to remain a prisoner of his own regulations, why Mr. Corsi could not be continued in this position.

I wish to make it crystal clear that, so far as the regulations and the legal requirements are concerned, there was no legal reason, nor is there any legal reason, why Mr. Corsi could not have been continued in his position.

I do not know why Mr. Dulles dismissed Mr. Corsi. His public statements on this matter are a maze of contradictions. Although Mr. Dulles states there was no security question involved, the fact of the matter is that the State Department felt there was sufficient of a security question to warrant referring the investigation to the FBI, and the Department used its security regulations as the ostensible basis for terminating Mr. Corsi's employment. But whatever may have been the real reason for Mr. Corsi's discharge, there is an important lesson to be learned from these circumstances. This is but another example of the weird uses to which the security programs, operating behind the security curtain and beyond public and congressional scrutiny, have been put. It also represents a classic example of the callous treatment our Government has afforded of late to competent, dedicated men and women in the public service.

Mr. President, I feel that this case will go down in the records of our Government as one of the most unfair and most intolerable cases of public administra-

tion and personnel administration which has ever been experienced.

I hope that in due time—and, I may say, at once—efforts will be made to correct the situation which gives rise to unfortunate incidents of this kind, which result in embarrassing people of competence and ability by double talk and by hiding behind security regulations which have no reference to the facts, and then ultimately using those regulations to dismiss someone simply because he may disagree on a matter of policy.

#### EXHIBIT 1

APRIL 28, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your letter of April 12, 1955, addressed to Secretary Dulles, has been referred to me for reply.

I list below the answers to your seven questions concerning Mr. Corsi's position with the Department.

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. It is the Department's consistent policy to request FBI investigations on all individuals considered for high-ranking appointments. In the instant situation, the FBI was requested to conduct an investigation of Mr. Corsi consistent with this policy, as well as because of the fact that unconfirmed information had come to the Department's attention which required such action in consonance with Executive Order 10450.
5. The investigation by the FBI referred to above was requested by letter under date of January 18, 1955. The completed reports of investigation by the FBI were received in the State Department on March 29, 1955. The Civil Service Commission, by letter dated April 5, 1955, advised the Department that the FBI investigation had been completed.
6. Since the investigation of Mr. Corsi was not conducted by the Department of State, no appraisal of the difficulty, or lack thereof, in this investigation can be made.
7. The Department has made some appointments in grades GS-4, and below, prior to the completion of a full field investigation which has extended beyond the 90-day period. This has not been true in grades classified above GS-4, and we are not aware of any exceptional cases such as you described in your question.

I hope the information included will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

#### L. & N. RAILROAD STRIKE AND SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO. STRIKE

MR. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week I observed with pleasure that the L. & N. Railroad strike, which has been so troublesome to the South and which has had such a bad effect on our economy, was settled by the arbitration method. The men went back to work, the trains began running, and the unresolved issues were submitted to impartial arbitration.

At that time I stated that another strike, now in its ninth week and similarly serious in its effects, could also be settled by the arbitration method. I referred to the telephone strike.

I informed the Senate that I had sent a telegram to both Mr. Fred J. Turner, president, Southern Bell Telephone &



Telegraph Co., and Mr. Joe Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, urging that the telephone strike be submitted to arbitration. Following is the text of my telegram:

The telephone strike, involving some 50,000 workers and seriously affecting my State and other Southern States, is now in its ninth week. It is my understanding that the major point in dispute is a no-strike clause. I urge both parties to this dispute to agree to a resumption of work, submitting all unresolved items of the proposed contract to impartial arbitration, the arbitrators to be made up of a panel selected from a slate named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and findings to be binding on both parties. I feel that the public interest requires early settlement of this strike.

Mr. Beirne, president of the Union, replied by telegram, and following is the text of his wire:

Re your wire of today regarding the telephone strike in the nine Southeastern States and your suggestion that the matter be submitted to impartial arbitration. You are correct that the no-strike clause is the major item in dispute. However, there are some 16 additional items which remain to be resolved. Prior to the actual beginning of the strike, CWA made a proposal to the company to arbitrate these unsettled issues. When the three-governor subcommittee of the Southern Governors' Conference requested of both parties whether or not they were willing to submit the remaining issues in dispute to arbitration, CWA agreed. The company refused. We have continually stated publicly and to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service that we are willing to submit these issues to arbitration. Therefore, to you we unequivocally state that we would be willing to submit the unresolved issues to impartial arbitration and that the arbitrators to be made up of a panel selected from a slate named by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and that their findings be binding on both parties. Your interest in this matter is deeply appreciated. The union, too, feels that it would be in the public interest that an early settlement of this strike be consummated. We hope the company will agree to your proposal.

I informed the Senate that Mr. Turner, president of the company, had advised me by wire that he was writing a letter giving the company's position, and that the Senate would be advised of the contents of his letter when it was received.

I have the letter in my hand, signed by Mr. Turner, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. The letter sets forth the attitude of the company in refusing arbitration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN BELL TELEPHONE &  
TELEGRAPH CO.,  
Atlanta, Ga., May 10, 1955.  
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Your continued interest in the telephone strike in Tennessee and in the other eight Southeastern States is very much appreciated by me.

You will be interested to know that, as I wrote you on April 4, telephone service in Tennessee and in the other States involved is practically normal. I know of no reason

at the present time why the service should not remain substantially normal, particularly since the situation in east Tennessee is now greatly improved.

You may be assured that, I too, am earnestly seeking an early resumption of work by those employees of the company who are still on strike. You, doubtless, have been advised that, although some 30,000 workers are on strike, there are nearly 32,000 workers who are operating the facilities of the company and rendering the service to which I referred.

The issues at stake in the strike are fundamental to the operation of this public-service enterprise. They involve not only the no-strike clause, but also the basic responsibility of management to manage the business. It is our firm conviction that these vital matters should not be subject to arbitration.

The constitution and the laws of your State impose a public duty and obligation on the company to render adequate telephone service when it has sought and enjoyed franchise rights granted by the constituted authorities. Neither your public service commission nor your courts would permit this company to shift its legal and normal responsibilities to those who, having been selected as arbitrators and whose temporary duty had been fulfilled, no longer would have any accountability to the public.

No one is more aware than I of the economic impact of this strike on the individual employees of the company. Each of these employees was employed and trained by the company and the company provided a position of security for them. These positions still await all who desire to return, except those who have participated in criminal conduct, vandalism, and like acts of violence discreditable to the company.

I know that you will be deeply interested in the enclosed bulletin concerning the company's position on arbitration. Your particular attention is called to pages 7, 8, and 9 which show the extent to which arbitration is now available under the company's contract with the union.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is now actively directing collective bargaining between the two parties. I firmly believe that these negotiations will result in a contract that will be fair to all concerned.

Please again accept my very profound appreciation for your interest. You may be assured that I shall employ every resource at my command toward bringing about a reasonable settlement and a return to work of the employees who are on strike.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. TURNER,  
President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the letter Mr. Turner makes reference to a pamphlet entitled "Arbitration Is Not the Answer," which he enclosed, and in which he specifically made references to pages 7, 8, and 9, dealing with arbitration arrangements now available. I ask unanimous consent that pages 7, 8, and 9 of the pamphlet be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the pages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following gives more detailed information on the scope of arbitration in our contracts with the union. It contains the wording of article IX, section 2, of the recognition agreement and a check list of the principal items in the working agreement, showing those which are subject to arbitration and those which are not.

# ARBITRATION PROVISIONS IN SOUTHERN BELL—

C. W. A. CONTRACTS

## Recognition agreement

### Article IX. Arbitration

SEC. 2. If at any time a controversy should arise between the union and the company regarding the true intent and meaning of any provisions of this or any other agreement between the parties or a controversy as to the performance of any obligation hereunder, which the parties are unable to compose by full and complete use of the grievance procedure set up by article III of this agreement, the matter shall be arbitrated upon written request of either party to this agreement to the other.

## Working agreement

The following check list will indicate whether or not arbitration is available on the subjects listed. The list includes all items that are not subject to arbitration.

	Arbitration	
	Available	Not available
Absences from duty:		
Payment for employees who become sick at work.....	X	
Payment during first 7 days sickness.....	X	
Extended absence due to illness.....	X	
Military leaves.....	X	
Choice of tours.....	X	
Contract work.....	X	
Craft work by supervisors.....	X	
Demotions:		
After 3 months on job.....	X	
Before 3 months on job.....		X
(See Discharges and demotions.)		
Discharges:		
After 12 months on job.....	X	
Before 12 months on job.....		X
Employment termination.....	X	
Termination allowance.....	X	
Excused absences with pay.....	X	
Expense:		
In connection with transfers.....	X	
Split tours.....	X	
Supper.....	X	
Transportation, intercity.....	X	
Travel.....	X	
Force adjustments.....	X	
Reduction in force.....	X	
Rehiring after layoff.....	X	
General records.....	X	
Grievance procedure.....	X	
Health and safety.....		X
Holiday pay.....	X	
Hours of work and basis of compensation:		
Work schedules.....	X	
Scheduling tours.....	X	
Arrangement of tours.....	X	
Part tours.....	X	
Relief periods.....	X	
Overtime payment.....	X	
Call-out pay.....	X	
Noncompounding of overtime.....	X	
Sunday pay.....	X	
Equalization of premium pay work opportunity.....	X	
Differential payments.....	X	
Eligibility for payment.....	X	
Job description, job titles, and job classifications.....	X	
Leaves of absence.....		X
Pension plan.....		X
Limitation on increasing benefits.....	X	
Personnel records.....	X	
Promotions and job vacancies.....	X	
Posting job vacancies.....	X	
Filling job vacancies.....	X	
Promotional increase treatment.....	X	
Appeal rights.....	X	
Rescheduling absent time.....	X	
Seniority:		
Extent and limitation.....	X	
Application.....	X	
Employees transferred.....	X	
Effect on posted work schedule.....	X	
Preference for training.....	X	
Starting rates.....	X	
Suspensions (as offered to union on 3-8-55).....	X	
Technological displacements.....	X	
Transfers and travel expense.....	X	
To exchanges having lower schedules.....	X	
To exchanges having higher schedules.....	X	
To lower rated job classifications.....	X	
To higher rated job classifications.....	X	
At the instance of employees.....	X	
At the instance of the company.....	X	
Travel time and travel conditions.....	X	

	Arbitration	
	Available	Not available
Union functioning:		
Promotions and transfers of union officers	X	
Bulletin boards	X	
Union activity on company property	X	
Vacations:		
Vacation eligibility	X	
Vacation assignments	X	
Vacation pay	X	
Vacation treatment to employees leaving the service	X	
Vacation treatment for employees returning to the service	X	
Vacation treatment for employees transferring	X	
Vacation treatment to sick employees	X	
Vacation limitations	X	
Wages:		
Wage rates	X	
Starting rates	X	
Wage progression schedules	X	
Effective date for progression increases	X	

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish now to discuss this matter for a moment. It will be noted that there are two arbitration agreements in this pamphlet. The one under the heading "Article IX, Arbitration," is headed "Recognition Agreement," and I understand it is the arbitration clause in the agreement by which the company recognizes the union as the bargaining agent. It covers arbitration of disputes arising under that recognition agreement.

The second provision, under the heading "Working Agreement," is a checklist prepared by the company outlining the things for which arbitration is available and is not available under the present working contract.

Mr. President, under the proposed new contract there is a no-strike clause, by which the union agrees not to strike during the course of the contract. A no-strike clause requires enforcement. Work stoppages can and do occur without the intention of any responsible officials of either management or union. Under the no-strike clause the company would take disciplinary action for any such stoppages. What the union wants, I understand, in view of the fact that they will agree to a no-strike clause, is the right to have arbitrated by neutral parties the disciplinary action taken with regard to arguments arising, as a result of the no-strike provision, over such things as suspensions, demotions, and discharges.

I think that reasonable men ought to be able to get together when the differences are so small. However, these parties began their negotiations in July of last year, and negotiated up until the strike began in March. Tempers have flared on both sides. Based on the number of persons who Mr. Turner says are out and the average wage paid them, I would estimate that the strike is costing more than \$1,300,000 a week in wages alone in the 9-State area. It is time that it be settled.

This is, it seems to me, a dispute that could be arbitrated. When negotiators cannot agree after 10 months—and when the business concerned is a public utility designed to serve all the people—then it is time to call in neutral outside par-

ties to settle the differences. That is all arbitration amounts to, and I would certainly urge the company to consider the matter further for the benefit of the public interest, if for no other reason.

#### VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY REPRESENTATIVES OF ASIATIC COUNTRIES, UNDER SPONSORSHIP OF THE TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to say a word of appreciation of a great project which the sponsors of the well-known radio program Town Meeting of the Air have just completed. Their effort resulted in having leaders from a number of Asiatic countries flown to the United States, for the purpose of touring our country, participating in Town Hall programs, giving Americans information on the Asiatic situation, telling our folks how we are regarded in the Asiatic countries, and pointing out ways in which we can bring about greater understanding among the people of our country and the people in their countries.

These friends from Asia traveled in all parts of our country. Some of them spent some time in South Dakota, visiting our farms, talking to our people, and observing Missouri River Dam developments. They were wonderful missionaries of good will.

Following their tour of this country, Representative Brooks Hays and I participated in a Town Meeting program with these visitors. I feel that the views they expressed, the observations they made, and the suggestions they contributed are of real interest; and, therefore, I ask permission to have the transcript of that broadcast inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is entitled "As Asians See Us."

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### AS ASIANS SEE US

ANNOUNCER. Town Meeting comes to you tonight from the Senate Radio Gallery in the Nation's Capitol where we bring together the members of an important project in the field of international relations. Town Meeting listeners still recall the epoch-making world tour of this program in 1949, on which representative Americans, forming the World Town Hall Seminar, met with people of similar interests in 12 nations from Britain to Japan. This was the first of Town Hall's international projects on a people-to-people basis. Since then, this pioneer adult education center has been the spearheading agency for similar missions between leaders of Egypt, and our neighbors to the north and south—Canada and Mexico. This year, Town Hall developed a project with leaders of the Near East and Asia who, with two distinguished Members of Congress, are gathered here in Washington for a report to the American people.

Now, to preside as moderator of our discussion, here is the well-known Washington commentator, Gunnar Back. Mr. Back.

Mr. BACK. Good evening, friends. We have for you tonight, a rather different approach of Town Meeting which, in a basic sense, becomes a worldwide roundtable through the expression of opinion by representatives

of 10 different nations, including the United States.

Seated here in the Senate Radio Gallery in the Capitol Building in Washington—with Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota and Representative Brooks Hays, Democrat, of Arkansas—are nine members of the Asia Town Hall Mission who have just concluded a 7-week tour of our country—several of them visiting America for the first time. They have seen the east and west coasts, the States between, the North and the South. Accompanied by Mr. Robert L. Clifford, who has directed the project for Town Hall, our guests have visited these American cities: New York, Princeton, Philadelphia, Toledo, Chicago, Dayton, Minneapolis, Yankton, Omaha, St. Louis, Kansas City, Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Dallas, New Orleans, Chattanooga, Cincinnati, and Atlanta—so the impressions which they bring you tonight are based on a very comprehensive look at the United States.

In cooperation with local world affairs councils of the Foreign Policy Association, they have talked with tens of thousands of Americans in this journey of theirs. In keeping with the Town Hall philosophy that the path to mutual understanding is a two-way street, they have come here for a free exchange of ideas, knowledge, and experiences. The members of the mission now return to their home countries. We believe they will have learned a little more about us—as the American people most assuredly have learned more about them and their problems.

So that we may share each other's views with our listeners across the Nation, we have invited them to join us for a frank and informal discussion here on Town Meeting. Senator MUNDT and Congressman HAYS will be glad to answer their questions as we go along, and they also will have questions for our Asian guests.

First, I would like to identify them briefly for you. In the custom of ladies first I'll begin. Mrs. Amina El-Said, a journalist of Cairo, Egypt; Miss Nilawarn Pintong, editor of a woman's magazine in Thailand; Mr. G. Ramachandran, director of the Gandhigram Rural Workers Training Center in India; Mohamad Roem, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia; Roberto Villanueva, general manager of the Manila Chronicle; Abdul Kerim al-Uzri, Member of Parliament of Iraq; George Togasaki, president of the Nippon Times of Tokyo and chairman of the board of International Christian University; Cao Thai Bao, Commissioner for Political and Administrative Affairs of the State of South Viet-Nam; and Musa Nasir, director of the Junior College, Bir Ziet, in Jordan.

To begin our discussion, I'd like to call on several of you first for some general impressions. I know that you must have many impressions. I'm going to hope that you'll make the general impressions fairly short. Mr. Togasaki, will you tell us what your impression has been of this trip?

Mr. TOGASAKI. In the first place, the Americans have become greatly interested in world affairs. We often hear of the isolation policy, but nowhere on this trip have we been faced with isolationist expressions. The efforts of the local authorities—local people—World Affairs Councils, to diffuse world education to the younger generation has been very, very impressive. In general I may say that world education has been diffused throughout the country.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Togasaki, we often talk about our middlewestern area as being isolationist and I note that you did visit some of the middlewestern areas. You found then an interest in world affairs out there in the Middle West?



Mr. TOGASAKI. Particularly so in the Midwest. I was pleasantly surprised in Yankton, a small community of some 6,000 or more, gathering together in the auditorium at Yankton College to hear world affairs and to pose very interesting questions.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Togasaki, let me say as a Senator from South Dakota that I am very gratified to hear that report because Yankton is in South Dakota, in fact, it is the mother city of the Dakotas.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Villanueva, you are a journalist from the Philippines. Perhaps you'll give us your general estimate of this trip of yours?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. During the tour I had only one trouble in America, and that was having my name pronounced correctly. Apparently although Americans are quick to grasp any problem, in the question of foreign languages they have fallen very much behind. But, seriously, we feel like people who have had the opportunity to take a 3-D view of America. We have not only been able to appreciate the size and the magnitude of this country, but the best of the American spirit. In going through different States, coming from the East and going to the West, we have naturally seen great changes in climatic conditions, in the landscape of the country, and differences in the temper, in the mood and in the tempo of the life of peoples—but one thing that impressed us greatly was the great unity that exists among the American people. I think it can be said that America speaks with one voice and acts in unison on great issues effecting this country.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Villanueva. Now let's turn to Mr. Ramachandran for his general view of the United States of America.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. We in India have a fairly good knowledge of what is happening in this country because people are very much interested. The New York Times is widely read in India so I came with certain interests, and I must say that I have received no shock at all. Neither the bigness of your cities, nor the vastness of your areas, nor the temper of your people—the understanding of the people—in none of these areas have I had any shock whatsoever. But I have had, if I may contradict myself for a moment, slightly pleasant shocks—pleasant shocks than I had expected. For instance, I have found that the people are far more tolerant than they appear to be before world public opinion. People are far more interested in the outside world than I thought that they were. Now this has been a good surprise to me. And one other thing which I must mention is that Americans have some wonderful illusions about themselves. They think, for instance, that they are a terrific people living in a terrific way, but what I have discovered is that the Americans are perfectly normal, good, quiet people with great family loyalties amongst themselves—altogether quite a normal people. This picture I wish to carry back to my country.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Ramachandran, what do you think of American food?

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. American food—again, I had heard before I came was terrific—but it's perfectly normal food.

Senator MUNDT. Maybe he hasn't tried the Senate bean soup. There is something terrific.

Mr. BACK. Perhaps he'll have a chance to do that while he's here in Washington. Let me go to the next question now which, in some respects, has been answered. Do you feel that the American people are sufficiently informed about the Near East and Asia, Mrs. El-Said of Egypt?

Mrs. EL-SAID. Well, sir, throughout our visit, or our tour, which took 7 weeks, we felt that the people were definitely less informed about our problems in the Middle East than we hoped them to be. In some

cases they know one side of the subject and not the other. Of course, I must admit that they have always been ready to listen to us and to learn from us, and quick to grasp and to form a just opinion—but we want more and more of this. You know the Middle East, Egypt and the other countries, has become a very sensitive part of the world at the present, if not the most sensitive part of the world. I believe mutual understanding and mutual interests in each other will help a great deal in participating for peace, or, it will help freedom.

Mr. BACK. Mrs. El-Said, did you find that looking over our American newspapers and perhaps having a chance to listen to a radio here and watch television, did you feel that we gave fairly adequate news coverage to the Near East?

Mrs. EL-SAID. No, sir. Very little, I am sorry to say. And what there is is not enough. We want more of it.

Mr. BACK. You would like to see our newspapers cover more stories from your part of the world?

Mrs. EL-SAID. Yes; more news of that part of the world to help the people understand us, because, you see, it is unfair to us that the Americans will judge us through their own standpoint of view. We are very different.

Mr. BACK. Do you, in turn, feel that your papers in Egypt cover us adequately?

Mrs. EL-SAID. We can't help it because we actually live on the West and we can't do without the West. We are so interested in the international problems and in national politics because it affects us directly.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much. I want to turn now to Miss Nilawarn of Thailand with that same question. Do you feel that the American people are sufficiently informed toward your country?

Miss NILAWARN. Yes. As a visitor from Thailand I noticed this all along our tour among special groups, such as the people in the World Affairs Councils and people who are internationally minded. The answer is yes but, by and large, no—because the concern for freedom and the generosity of the American people themselves seem to overwhelm their insight into the minds of the Asia peoples. American knowledge is based more on external appearance of the Asian countries rather than on the substance. What is needed, I might propose, is the deeper and truer sympathy, and not just merely aid.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much. I am sure that the fact that you've been here and we've had a chance to talk to you has helped a lot, and I hope that I'll see a good deal more of that. We Americans have a good deal to learn because we're looking over a vast part of the earth all the time now. Let's turn to our next question. I'm picking these out of the air more or less, but we, ourselves, sometimes find it difficult to define what generally is called the American way of life. We try, of course, constantly, and we are always interested in what visitors to our country might define as the American way of life. Perhaps I might try that with you, Mr. al-Uzri of Iraq. Most people who visit our country have some impression of the American way of life. What is yours?

Mr. AL-UZRI. It is really very difficult to define, the American way of life, especially if you are visiting America for the first time, but I can pick up some of the main features which have impressed me. In the first place, I have noticed this great equality and especially the opportunity for all the people in that there are no classes, no distinctions. Secondly, the great respect for the individual and his liberty and dignity in the United States of America. The third feature found was the high standard of living enjoyed practically by all, and the fourth feature which impressed me was the tempo with which you go about your work.

Mr. BACK. You then feel that we have a tempo here in contrast to Mr. Ramachandran, who feels that we don't move along as fast as we think we do? Did you notice a fast or slow tempo?

Mr. AL-UZRI. We noticed certainly the fast tempo.

Mrs. EL-SAID. I was only going to ask you, sir, a question. Why are you all in a hurry? I mean, I can understand it if it is in business but it's also in pleasure, so why?

Senator MUNDT. I think I can answer that because most of us believe in the philosophy of a great early American by the name of Benjamin Franklin, of whom I am sure you have heard, and in his Copybook he said "Be aware of time because that is the stuff of which life is made," and so people want to accomplish a great deal in the span of a lifetime.

Mrs. EL-SAID. Believe me, a little rest will be a great help.

Mr. BACK. Well, I myself would like to take things a lot slower, but whenever I do everybody else is way ahead of me. How about you, Congressman HAYS, what do you think of our tempo?

Representative HAYS. I think there is good counsel in what our visitor has said. I think we should slow down. Of course, we Democrats have to be in a hurry to keep the Republicans from getting ahead of us, but it's still good advice and I think we could profit from it.

Senator MUNDT. That sounds interesting to me, coming from a southerner, because we think the southerners have sort of slowed down the tempo and have a delightful tempo of life which, up in the North, we don't practice to the extent that you do.

Mr. AL-UZRI. I have heard many times—the American people have told us—take it easy. I believe that this take it easy is a necessity because of the American doctrine of life and the high standards generated by Americans.

Senator MUNDT. I sometimes feel that why we're going so fast is because we're more mechanized than other parts of the world. Mrs. El-Said, I have been in Cairo, Egypt, a number of times and I must confess that I am shocked by the tempo with which people on foot move up and down the streets of Cairo.

Mrs. EL-SAID. You mean you were shocked at the speed or the slowness?

Senator MUNDT. The speed—I think they walk more rapidly than Americans.

Mr. BACK. We have a number of questions that immediately concern the United States to a high degree. For example, the Bandung Conference, the Asian-African Conferences just concluded. I know that you've been in this country while it was on, but I am sure that all of you have followed it very closely. What is your feeling about the conclusions that seems to have been reached there, Mr. Villanueva?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. I'm not yet too familiar with all the resolutions adopted at Bandung. I've just read the newspaper this morning.

Mr. BACK. Did it all turn out as the Philippines thought it might?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. Well, actually, it was not so much of a surprise to us in Asia as it was to Americans, by and large. We always thought that a conference of Asian peoples was necessary at this time because it would be a very timely conference. There were very many things that we had in common—many problems that are typical of all our countries on which we could exchange views and information. Now, the Bandung Conference is significant because it has given the Asian and African peoples an opportunity to examine the pros and cons of communism and democracy, and they have faced this question squarely at that Conference. I think it merely reveals that there is a great understanding of the world problems in Asia and Africa today. Now, we all had hopes

that this Conference would devote more time to the economic, social, and cultural problems of Asia and Africa, because it is in this field that we thought it would really do a lot of good. Apparently there was not too much time to do this, but we hope that in the future another conference of this nature could be called to devote the energies and talents of our leaders to this vital question.

Mr. BACK. One more thing, Mr. Villanueva. Did you feel that the non-Communist representatives at that Conference made themselves fully heard? You know, there are people here who thought it might be dominated by the Red Chinese.

Mr. VILLANUEVA. I think they had a chance to do that, not only at the primary sessions, but in their personal contacts with all the delegates at the Conference. I think we all know how conventions are run and many things are done behind the scenes, and I am sure that the representatives of the Communists, as well as the non-Communist nations of Asia, and those who stand for neutrality had a chance to express each other's viewpoints effectively.

Mr. BACK. I want to turn to Mr. Roem. His country, after all, was the host nation to this Conference. He's been an official of his country of Indonesia. Mr. Roem, what is your estimate of the results of the Bandung Conference?

Mr. ROEM. I think that the result of the Bandung Conference is most satisfactory. I may say that it is also satisfactory for those who had expressed some concern before the beginning of the Conference. Stress has been laid on cooperation in the economic and cultural field among the countries who have participated in the Bandung Conference. These are countries who are in the beginning stage of their economic development and cooperation in that field is very important. Cooperation in the cultural field is also very important for these countries because there are so many common things in their culture and in their history. I think the resolutions that were made are mostly based on human rights. About the Palestine problem, we have expressed the desire that the resolution of the United Nations must be carried out, and I think that nobody will be against this, and we expressed the hope that Morocco and Tunisia will be free in the soonest possible time.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Roem. I am sure that the two Members of Congress who are with us may want to ask a question or two on that. I don't want to stay too long on the Bandung Conference, but I did want to know whether you had a question, Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Yes, I do. I'd like to ask Mr. Roem a question. I was gratified and impressed by the fact that the Conference at Bandung seemed to place a great emphasis on human rights. I have the personal feeling that any conference in the world anywhere which concentrates its emphasis on human rights, by that very nature has to point out the deficiencies and the weaknesses of communism, because communism is a way of life and a system of politics which entirely nullifies human rights for the individual, and I wonder whether Mr. Roem would agree with me on that observation, or whether he would care to comment about it?

Mr. ROEM. People were concerned about the role which Chou En-lai would play in this Conference, but I think that the outcome of the Conference proved to be that he had not dominated the Conference. I, myself, am for the democratic way of life—not communism.

Representative HAYS. I would like to revert to what Mr. Roem said about economic phases and, of course, the human-rights phases are, to some extent, bound up with economic problems, too. They're not completely separate. One of the visitors from a country that participated in this Confer-

ence, and I believe there were about 30, was in America some time ago—a young college student—and one of our college lads asked this question: "What does your country expect of the United States?" His answer was very striking. He said, "Two things: respect and rice, and in that order." I liked that because it did place values in their right relation, and if he should ask me what our country expects I would say respect and a market for rice, in that order, because we have a surplus of rice.

Senator MUNDT. Would you mind including a market for wheat along with that?

Representative HAYS. If I were from South Dakota, I would put it in those terms, but I was glad to have pointed up the problems of our country, and the fact that here we have a common interest. People want rice—we want a market for rice. But I realize, at the same time, there are countries among your 30 that have a surplus of rice, too, and we must not ask for a market in any country that creates economic maladjustments in other countries, and I would like to pose that question for you, who are leaders in your respective countries, to enlighten us. How can we find these markets without disrupting your economic stability, and how can the 30 countries work toward a situation in which they relate their economic interests to our economic interests in the Western Hemisphere? That's a big order, but I thought you wouldn't mind speaking to that question.

Mr. ROEM. My country has not a market for your rice. My country has a market for many other articles from America, so you need not be concerned about that. But the economic cooperation between these countries is the kind of cooperation which is very useful for countries who are in the beginning phase of their economic development. Their experiences in the past few years might be very useful to one another. It does not mean that we are not in cooperation with the countries outside these countries, but as young countries, experience just received in the past few years is very important—perhaps more important than experience of countries who have developed their economy for more than a century.

Representative HAYS. I don't want to take the time, I want our visitors to have the time, but might I relate that to what we have tried to do in the Western Hemisphere through the Organization of American States which has its economic aspects. Now, I realize that the 30 countries spread across a vast area and perhaps in Bandung some preliminary conversations were conducted which would enable them to break it down, so that if the 30 don't get together on some kind of economic interrelationship, understandings, and agreement, that there can be some breakdown into regional understandings. In other words, it will enable us all to get along together a little better in economic terms. I wanted to just add that comment.

Mr. BACK. Thank you, Congressman Hays. I want to go on now to some other matters and we're going to have to hurry a little because the field is very wide. The whole question of Formosa is one that, of course, greatly concerns us, and I was just wondering whether I could ask you, Mr. Villanueva, to tell us how you think Asians would react to United States armed participation in the defense of the offshore islands first?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. I would not pretend to speak for Asia on this issue. It is very explosive, and I know that Asia does not speak with one voice on this matter. Perhaps I shall try to reflect the Philippine view on the subject. Now, as you know, we in the Philippines view with concern the question of Formosa, because Formosa is very close to us. It was the staging point for the invasion of the Philippines, and on a clear day you can see Formosa from our northernmost island, Ithbayat, so they're very close to us and we, naturally, would like to see Formosa in

friendly hands. The Philippine Government, as a matter of fact, is officially committed to stand by the United States and it has offered its manpower and resources in the defense of Formosa. Now the question of Quemoy and Matsu, in my mind, as a layman, is strictly a military decision. It is one, in fact, which I think should not even be debated publicly. Can we, or can we not, hold Quemoy and Matsu? Well, that is strictly a military decision and the military commanders on the spot perhaps are in a better position to decide that. As a layman, I say that if Quemoy and Matsu—being important for the defense of Formosa, as it has often been pointed out—can be held with the forces that we have on the spot, well, I think it would be a wise military decision to do so, but this would require a full knowledge of the military potential.

Mr. BACK. The Philippines, being a member of the Southeast Treaty Organization, you go along then pretty much with the American position right now?

Mr. VILLANUEVA. We stand side by side with you and we abide by any decision of President Eisenhower.

Mr. BACK. I think now we ought to address the question to Mr. Ramachandran, who represents India today.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. I am very happy you have turned to me for an answer, and I have listened very carefully to what my friend from the Philippines said about it. Any military decision in the modern world becomes at once a world problem. You cannot isolate a decision as a military decision and keep it as a military decision. It immediately can explode into a world problem and the whole question of Formosa, as it strikes India, is that here is a magnificent opportunity for sane people to sit together and prove that the most difficult controversies can be discussed and solved on a peaceful basis. I think the whole of the Bandung Conference is proving that the most difficult things should be capable of being discussed around the table and settled peacefully, so we do not look upon Formosa as a point of explosion for a world war. We look upon Formosa as the point of explosion for a tremendous movement for peace in the world, and peace to be obtained around conference tables. I think this is the great lead that has already come out of Formosa. I would like to ask a question myself. I would like to ask, for instance, Mr. Brooks Hays and the Senator from South Dakota, What do you think of the role that India has played in the Formosa Conference?

Senator MUNDT. You mean, I presume, in the Formosan controversy?

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Yes; and the Bandung Conference.

Senator MUNDT. Well, I would say from the standpoint of Formosa that I am one of those who believe that nothing could be more injurious to Asia and its long-term constructive hopes than the loss of Formosa to the Communist hands, that we must make that as the positive goal of all freedom-loving peoples everywhere, that Formosa must not be lost to the Communists. Having said that, I would say that I certainly agree with your hope that we can solve the Formosan situation without loss, that it can be done around the conference table, or that it can be done by peaceful methods, but I do not believe that any of us can countenance the constantly outward march of communism, because if it were to get Formosa, it would never stop there. It would be looking toward Japan, it would be looking toward the Philippines, or somewhere else. But I can assure my good friend from India that Americans abhor war and detest war, probably as much as any people in the world. We have no territorial ambitions, we are not in favor of aggression of any type, and you may be sure that war will not be precipitated, will not be started in that area by the United States.



Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Would you agree to the United Nations trusteeship over Formosa?

Senator MUNDT. No; I would not agree to the United Nations trusteeship over India, nor over the Philippines, nor over any independent sovereign country such as Formosa.

Representative HAYS. I think in stressing the value of conference our friend from India, Mr. Ramachandran, has made an excellent point, and he asked of Mr. MUNDT and myself judgments as to the participation of India and its contribution at Bandung. I think that while there is not time to discuss it elaborately, that one reply that he would be interested in is the comment of Senator GEORGE, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the newspaper editors the other evening, when he said that while some of the spokesmen for India sometimes bewilder us, and our friend will understand that since we're not so well acquainted with their point of view, nevertheless we feel that in the fundamental cleavages of our world they are on our side. We're all fighting for independence, and they are making a great contribution which we appreciate now, as we did not in an earlier period. Senator GEORGE paid a fine tribute to India, and it was a good plea.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Thank you very much. Mr. BACK. Now let's go to South Viet-Nam, that's in our headlines also. Mr. Cao Thai Bao is Commissioner for Political and Administrative Affairs in the state of South Viet-Nam. Can you tell us whether the present government of that country is going to survive, in your opinion and, secondly, how is that election going to turn out?

Mr. Bao. I do hope that in July 1956, as required by the Geneva Pact, we have general elections.

Mr. BACK. That election will determine whether South Viet-Nam continues as a free state or becomes Communist?

Mr. Bao. We have to choose if we want Communist government, or non-Communist government, but, if we can get a free election which we want and we need, we are sure, as far as South Viet-Nam is concerned, that we will win the elections, that is, if we have free elections.

Mr. BACK. What will keep you from having free elections, in your opinion?

Mr. Bao. Under the terms of the Geneva Pact, we are committed to discuss in July 1955, with representatives from North Viet-Nam, the procedures and the type of election campaign we will have in the 1956 elections.

Mr. BACK. What sort of a picture do you see right now? Are you going to get those free elections?

Mr. Bao. If we had the election right now, I can assure you we would win the elections. Note that one-tenth of the population in Communist North Viet-Nam is now migrating as refugees to live in free South Viet-Nam.

Mr. BACK. How about the present government of Premier Diem? Is that government going to survive, in your opinion?

Mr. Bao. I am sure that Premier Diem will survive, although he has many troubles.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, and now let's hurry along here. We have so many fields to cover. Mr. Nasir, of Jordan, you're an educator. I want to ask you this question: Do Asians and the people of the Near East fear western dominance as much as they fear Communist dominance, more or less? What's the relationship, would you say, Mr. Nasir?

Mr. NASIR. That is like asking the question to compare between two meals or two kinds of food—one which you have tasted and one which you never have tasted. We have tasted western dominance and we didn't like it. We have not tasted Communist dominance, but from the description we don't like it, either. The question, however, seems to imply that we must accept

either western or Communist dominance. I don't think we agree to this implication and we'd rather have neither.

Mr. BACK. Thank you, Mr. Nasir. Mr. Roem, can I go to you again? Is the struggle in Asia essentially a struggle for the minds of men? We use that term in this country all the time.

Mr. ROEM. Yes; I would say the struggle in Asia is essentially the struggle for the minds of men, and the minds of men can only reach their highest development in a free country. As this question is asked under the heading of "Communism," I would say that our struggle for independence is a positive struggle. We never have said that we are struggling against communism because we haven't been dominated by communism, and I would add, because I would like the people in America to understand it more, my country has an independent foreign policy which is mostly mentioned as a neutral policy. This is a kind of policy that differs from your policy, but in our country we have accepted the democratic way of life, and democracy is not neutralism. I want to point out that if you call it neutralism, that it is only neutralism with regard to foreign policy, but in domestic affairs and in the pace of our life we have accepted the democratic way of life and this is not neutralism at all.

Senator MUNDT. As one of the authors of the so-called Smith-Mundt bill, which set up the Voice of America and our interchange of students and ideas, and our foreign information libraries, I would like to ask my friend, the fellow-educator from Jordan, and anybody else who would care to comment upon it, what your reaction is to the activities of the Voice of America in your part of the world, and to our foreign information libraries and the exchange of students and exchange of culture programs. Do you think this is helping to create mutual understandings and to solidify the democratic people around the world and like-thinking people—or do you think that pretty much our efforts in that direction may be misdirected?

Mr. NASIR. I would not say that the efforts are misdirected. I would say the purpose of this activity has been to create an understanding apparently. From that point of view, I would say it has only created an understanding of things which are simple, but it has not created any understanding or appreciation or acceptance of the policy of the United States regarding the Middle East. I mean the Middle East is very unhappy and this kind of information or education, although it is very helpful and accepted with a tremendous amount of gratefulness, still it cannot make people understand or appreciate, or even accept the policy with regard to the Middle East.

Senator MUNDT. I wonder if Mrs. El-Said would care to comment on that question?

Mrs. EL-SAID. I do agree with Mr. Nasir very much. The people of Egypt are so interested in the international affairs and the news from outside. They listen to the Voice of America and, actually, are very anxious to listen to the Voice of America. The American library we have in Cairo is very popular. Our boys and young people go and get books and really enjoy reading American books. But what is more important to us is the political understanding. That is what we need very much.

Mr. NASIR. Our first contact with Americans was with the American University of Beirut, and that has achieved the very best respect and has been really the cause for the deep respect and confidence of the Middle East toward the United States. It is on account of that American university that respect and confidence still remains, but unless we do something really on the political side, it would be difficult to continue that.

Mr. BACK. Miss Nilawarn, what do you think of our educational exchange program?

Miss NILAWARN. The Fulbright program and the teachers training program are most acceptable to us, but we would like to see stronger efforts made in the educational field to reach more people. That is, we would like to see a program aimed at increasing general literacy and at extending adult education activities and agricultural extension services. We also like the idea of exchanging young people between our two countries as a step in the direction of the one-world idea.

Mr. BACK. In other words, what we have done so far is fine, but you'd like to see it extended in many respects, is that it?

Miss NILAWARN. Yes, because now the exchange program is limited mainly to academic people. The program should be extended to reach the Thai farmers and rural people generally.

Mr. BACK. Thank you. I know that you've all been waiting for me to ask this question and I come to it now, although there are other fields that I would like to touch on some more, and that is, what are some of the major problems of your various countries. I think we've heard something of that. Let me turn to you, Mr. Ramachandran of India, and ask you what are some of the major problems of your country? That's a pretty general question, I know.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. It's a good question, even if it is general. The immediate and the most ardent need is to build up the internal strength in my country, unify the people, put away the caste system altogether which we have nearly done, establish social justice, educate the people and bring up the level of life of the people. They call this a constructive program. The Government of India and the people of India are plunged into this work, but immediately, if we are to continue building up internal strength, we need peace. Any breaking of peace will shatter the whole program of building the strength of the people, so I would say the most ardent problems are the problems of building up the internal strength of the country, and then getting peace to do the job.

Mr. BACK. Thank you. Mr. al-Uzri of Iraq, you are a member of Parliament of your country and I am sure that you can tell us what the pressing needs of your country are.

Mr. AL-UZRI. The most important problems in our part of the world, in the Arab world, and especially Iraq, are five, in my opinion. In the first place, we have the problem of economic and social development, the problem of reconstruction and building up strength. The second problem is the problem of political integration of the small Arab states into a federal state, especially those constituting the fertile crescent as a first step, or a nucleus to the larger federation. We would like the United States to take an interest in this project, similar to the interest it is taking in the federation of Europe. The third problem facing the present Iraq and the Arab world as a whole is the problem of liberating the Arab people still under foreign domination, to gain their political independence. The fourth problem, which is, in fact, the most important, is the Palestine problem, which hangs like a dark cloud on the horizon of the Arab east. Unless that problem is solved in a just manner, peace will continue to be disturbed. The fifth problem facing Iraq and the Arab world, as a whole, is the Communist danger which tries to infiltrate into the Middle East. These, in my opinion, are the five major problems facing Iraq and the entire Arab east.

Mr. BACK. Mr. al-Uzri, has our economic aid been too little, too late, or anything of that sort?

Mr. AL-UZRI. We have had practically no economic aid from the United States. We have had some technical aid by the provision of technical personnel on the basis of point 4. This aid, which we have had from

the point 4 program, was, in my opinion, too thinly spread and I wish we had it more concentrated on one objective, such as the establishment of an efficiently run technical school or a mechanical and agricultural college. In fact, this applies perhaps to all the Arab east. The Arab east, as a whole, has had too little, in fact, many of them have had no economic aid whatsoever.

Mr. BACK. Mr. Roem, of Indonesia, what type of aid does your country need from the United States, and do you want aid?

Mr. ROEM. Let me put it this way: My country is in the beginning of its development period, so we need many kinds of aid, but the problem is also under what terms aid is to be given and, at the present moment, we have accepted aid from the United States in the form of economic and technical aid. We would like to have also military aid but, at the present moment, your policy with regard to military aid is not consistent with our policy so at the present moment we have received and accepted only economic and technical aid.

Representative HAYS. I would like to ask Mr. Roem if he feels that technical assistance is too closely bound up with either military aid or economic aid, and would your people favor our making technical assistance or point 4 work a separate and distinct program?

Mr. ROEM. Yes; we would like to have your economic and technical aid a separate and distinct program from the military aid.

Mr. BACK. I have the impression, ladies and gentlemen, that the technical aid that the United States has given, and the technical aid the U. N. has given, has been one of the real things that you've all welcomed. It has been one of the things that has really meant something to your countries. Is that true?

Mr. ROEM. This is true, with regard to Indonesia.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. May I ask a question of the Senator and the Congressman? Have you studied, or have you cared to study, what is being done in India under the first 5-year plan, and what are the targets we have set before ourselves in the second-year plan? Have you taken an interest in this tremendous work of reconstruction going on, and how does it affect you?

Senator MUNDT. We have taken an interest in it, but, speaking for myself, I must say I am not an authority on the details of the program. I do know that as we consider these aid programs on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, on which I serve, we try as best we can to relate the aid which we make available to the desires and the ambitions of the people of India from the standpoint of strengthening them as a free part of the world.

Representative HAYS. I am glad that my colleague, Mr. MUNDT, brought that out. As I understand it, our program of technical assistance is not competitive. It doesn't conflict—at least, it should not conflict—with the Colombo Plan and with these other efforts to advance the standards of living there. We're very proud of what has been done in India by our technical-assistance representatives, not only by our Government people but, as we understand it, by many people financed by foundations and private organizations.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Do you know, for instance, that the Ford Foundation is doing a very magnificent piece of work in India, and we are deeply indebted for the help that they have given us. We are also appreciative of the fine work done by the Rockefeller Foundation over the years.

Representative HAYS. That represents the spirit of the American people.

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. Thank you.

Mr. NASIR. I think all the financial assistance which America has given to the various people is really an indication of the good

and genuine spirit of the Americans and this is why, probably, a tremendous amount of good will has been shown by the Americans, and has been more or less accepted by the rest of the world. We have accepted aid and we know that the amount of aid which has come to Jordan, although it was relatively small last year—we received \$8 million—but, still, this has helped our economy greatly and we are very deeply indebted for that. There is, however, one thing which I think the Americans ought to know—that this assistance, however necessary and however useful it may be, cannot make people just accept the various policies which may be directed to anyone.

Mr. BACK. Thank you, Mr. Nasir. We have so little time left and, Mr. Togasaki, we haven't heard very much from you since the start of the program, so this will be a hard question and I won't give you very much time, but what are the bases on which the American and Asian people should work to build a free and strong world. What is your estimate of that, sir?

Mr. TOGASAKI. I believe that there should be created a greater mutual understanding between the peoples, and in keeping with the statement made by Senator MUNDT, I must say that the USIA libraries that have been established in Japan, in particular, have been most helpful and most useful and very popular. A greater intercultural exchange will be very helpful and, furthermore, the interchange of peoples is most important through travel. The lubricating of the machinery of world trade on a two-way trade basis—these, I think, are the bases upon which we should work toward creating better understanding amongst the free world.

Mr. BACK. We have just a minute or so left, and I thought perhaps we could make a catchall here. Is there anybody that has another impression of America that they might want to present before we conclude this program? Have we left something out—something you've seen about America that struck you as unusual? Mr. Ramachandran?

Mr. RAMACHANDRAN. There is, in this country, a great fund of moral idealism beneath the surface. It comes from Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson and your great thinkers and writers. One thing that India would love to hear is that you are making the rediscovery of the moral and spiritual foundations of your great civilization and culture, and the moment you do it you will not merely materially lead India, but, perhaps, morally lead the whole world.

Mr. BACK. Thank you very much, and I want to express my thanks to everyone of you. It was sometimes difficult to handle this, there were so many of you and I know you all wanted to talk. Our thanks to all the members of the Asia Town Hall Mission, and to Senator MUNDT and Representative HAYS for this interesting discussion. To our guests from Asia and the Near East, may we say "happy landings" and we hope that you'll come again soon.

Our appreciation to the staff of the Senate Radio Gallery, and James Christenat and his associates at WMAL, ABC in Washington.

#### CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, the Senate will proceed, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed with the call of the calendar.

#### RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate was announced as first in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 309) for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### JOSE PEREZ GOMEZ

The bill (S. 892) for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue and 'deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Jose Perez Gomez. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Jose Perez Gomez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

#### AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 153, Calendar 217, let me say that it is my understanding that when this bill was discussed on the floor of the Senate, earlier in the week, announcement was made that certain Senators were preparing amendments to the bill. I further understand that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who reported the bill, is conferring with the Senators who are preparing the amendments; and it is hoped that agreement will be reached.

I wish to have the bill called before the Senate at the earliest possible date; and if an agreement can be worked out



over the weekend, we shall take up the bill on Tuesday, when we meet again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been made to its present consideration, the bill has been passed over.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 300) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 256) to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OF CERTAIN HOLDERS OF MORTGAGE-PURCHASE CONTRACTS

The bill (S. 1645) to permit certain holders of mortgage-purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I wish to submit a statement by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on Senate bill 1645. I am authorized to say that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] joins in the statement and in approving the bill.

I should like to read the statement, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN ON S. 1645

The purpose of this bill is to relieve hardship experienced by home builders who have proceeded in good faith, but who have been unable to consummate FHA or VA mortgages in time to deliver those mortgages to the FNMA before certain contracts with the FNMA expired.

Everyone agrees as to the legitimacy of these hardships, but it is most difficult to

determine the degree of hardship on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, this bill sets up an arbitrary standard for identifying the cases which have been pursued without negligence, and it enables the FNMA to look favorably upon other legitimate hardship cases which may fail to meet this arbitrary standard.

I cannot guarantee that the standard will not help some person who has proceeded without diligence. But I believe this bill represents the most reasonable solution to a difficult problem.

Mr. President, I repeat that the statement I have just read is one by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and is concurred in by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1645?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1645) to permit certain holders of mortgage purchase contracts with the Federal National Mortgage Association to exercise their rights under such contracts for additional periods of not to exceed 90 days, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "a", to strike out "reasonable"; in the same line, after the word "period", to strike out "(not to exceed ninety days)", in addition to the time provided in such contract" and insert "of six months after the date of enactment of this act"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "such", to strike out "time" and insert "contract"; in line 7, after the word "any", to strike out "unreasonable neglect" and insert "negligence"; after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 2. An application shall be considered as timely if it is forwarded to the Association not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this act.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 3. A statement by the holder of the purchase contract which identifies the properties to secure the mortgages to be sold under the contract and which properties are the subjects of Federal Housing Administration insurance commitments or Veterans' Administration certificates of reasonable value dated prior to March 1, 1955, shall be sufficient to determine the absence of negligence on the part of such holder.

And after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to permit the sale of mortgages to the Association by the holder of any mortgage purchase contract in a total principal amount which exceeds the amount specified in such contract.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal National Mortgage Association shall grant to any holder of a mortgage purchase contract, entered into with the Association between June 30, 1953, and July 1, 1954, a period of 6 months after the date of enactment of this act and without regard to whether such contract has expired, in which such holder may exercise his right under such contract to sell to the Association mortgages held by him, if the Association shall determine, upon the basis of a timely application filed with it by such holder, that the failure of such holder to fully exercise his right under such contract within the time allowed was not due to any negligence on his part.

SEC. 2. An application shall be considered as timely if it is forwarded to the Associa-

tion not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. A statement by the holder of the purchase contract which identifies the properties to secure the mortgages to be sold under the contract and which properties are the subjects of Federal Housing Administration insurance commitments or Veterans' Administration certificates of reasonable value dated prior to March 1, 1955, shall be sufficient to determine the absence of negligence on the part of such holder.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to permit the sale of mortgages to the Association by the holder of any mortgage purchase contract in a total principal amount which exceeds the amount specified in such contract.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for extension of mortgage purchase contracts of the Federal National Mortgage Association."

#### SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 669) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming will withhold his objection until I am able to make a brief statement.

Mr. BARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say quite frankly that I think the bill is of such great importance that it ought to be brought up by motion, rather than during the call of the calendar; and I sincerely hope that at an early date such a motion will be made and that the bill may then be discussed and passed by the Senate.

However, for the RECORD, I now wish to make a very brief statement regarding the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to provide the residents of the District of Columbia with a popularly elected mayor; popularly elected city council; popularly elected school board; and popularly elected nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives.

The objectives underlying the bill are, first, to relieve the Congress of the detail of District affairs, as has been done in the case of the Territories, while still retaining in Congress the control required by the Constitution; second, to create a representative local government for the District, chosen by the qualified electors; and, third, to provide an efficient and economical government for the District of Columbia.

Provision is made for the creation of a Board of Elections, consisting of five members appointed by the President, by

and with the advice and consent of the Senate, which Board will conduct all elections provided for in the bill. Such elected officials would be a mayor; District Council, composed of 9 members; a Board of Education, consisting of 9 members; and a nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives.

The first provision of the bill to become effective would be a referendum on the proposed charter. If a majority of those voting approve the charter, it would take effect next year; and in October, the officials would be elected to take office in January 1957. The mayor and council would take over the functions of the present Board of Commissioners, which would be abolished.

The basic features of this bill are substantially the same as those of Senate bill 2413, 83d Congress, reported to Senate; and those of Senate bill 1976, 82d Congress, which passed the Senate on January 22, 1951.

On April 27, 1955, the Committee on the District of Columbia was unanimous in ordering Senate bill 669 reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say most respectfully and very sincerely that I believe the Senate should give early consideration to the bill, and that the people of the District of Columbia should not be used any further as a congressional football.

The people of the District of Columbia are entitled to full American citizenship. Today they are not receiving it; and, in that sense, they are second-class citizens. The reason why they are second-class citizens, Mr. President, is that the Congress, in carrying out what I believe to be its clear duty, has consistently, over the years, evaded dealing with the question of giving to the people of the District of Columbia the precious American franchise right of home rule.

Certainly the time has come to call a halt to the delays in the matter of respecting the full citizenship rights of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, my statement is not meant as any reflection at all upon the Senator who objected to present consideration of the bill, for I believe that objection should be made to its consideration during the call of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar. Instead, I believe the bill should at an early date be made the business of the Senate, that there should be full debate on it, and that it should be passed, so that the American rights of the people of the District of Columbia, as I think those rights were fully contemplated and intended by the constitutional fathers, will be restored to them.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, my sole objection to the consideration of the bill is that I do not think it is a bill which should be considered on the call of the calendar. Personally, I am in favor of the bill, but I believe it should be brought up and considered by itself, on a day certain.

#### REGULATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 184) to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities

in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment on Senate bill 184.

My colleague [Mr. BEALL], chairman of the subcommittee which had charge of Senate bill 184 in the Committee on the District of Columbia, was unavoidably detained, so that he could not be present when the bill was called. I know the Senator from Maryland would like to have me invite the attention of the Senate to what is considered to be a very important bill.

Here, too, we have a bill which comes to the floor of the Senate with the unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee. It is very important that we clarify certain matters which affect the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

This happens to be a bill introduced by the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. It is a very sound bill. It might be looked upon as dealing with one of the chore duties of the Congress. That is just about what it is. In respect to this bill, we are really sitting as aldermen, as members of a city council. That is the kind of duty and jurisdiction which ought to be taken from the Congress, by its own act, by the passage of the home rule bill to which I have previously referred, namely, Senate bill 669, Calendar No. 256.

The Congress is acting as a sort of super city council. As such we cannot justify constantly postponing action on municipal problems. The people of the District of Columbia are entitled to a governmental organization which will give them efficient administration. Let me say very frankly that they do not now get efficient administration from the Congress. They are accorded exactly the type of treatment which they are receiving at the present time in connection with this bill.

It is easy, on the floor of the Senate, to postpone action upon measures affecting municipal problems of the District of Columbia. We do not consider them of great national importance, or as great national issues. However, they are of national importance. It is important that we, the Congress, the city council of the District of Columbia—which we really are—give the people of the District efficient municipal administration, so long as we retain unto ourselves control over the municipality of the District of Columbia. We should not be postponing action on such bills as this.

The District of Columbia Committee has done a great deal of hard work on the bill, under the able leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. The bill is ready for action. The average Senator—and let us be frank about this—is too busy to take the time to study District of Columbia municipal legislative problems, so it is much easier to pass the buck by way of delay.

Let me say most respectfully that the Senate has every reason to have complete confidence in its Committee on the District of Columbia. I have sat with other members of that committee, and I have observed them during the course of many hours of hearings. They are taking their work very seriously as aldermen of the District of Columbia.

I think we have fallen into a bad practice in the Senate when a District of Columbia bill comes before us of postponing consideration of the bill. I do not ask for action as a matter of formality. I want Senators to check into the work of the Committee on the District of Columbia. But it is rather disheartening and discouraging to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia, which we all recognize, is considered to be at the bottom of the totem pole, so far as Senate committees are concerned, and then have our hard work meet with postponement and delay in the Senate.

A good job is being done. I speak not of myself but of my colleagues on the committee. A good job has been done by the Senator from Maryland, I think the bill is deserving of the early consideration of the Senate. If we cannot get it through on the call of the calendar, I think the leadership of the Senate should schedule the bill for early consideration.

I understand that we are in somewhat of a legislative lull in the Senate at the present time. Therefore, I respectfully recommend to the majority leader and the minority leader that at an early time—within the next few days—both Senate bill 669, Calendar No. 256, and Senate bill 184, Calendar No. 258, be scheduled for early consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1633) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### INVITATION TO HOLD 1960 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES AT SQUAW VALLEY, CALIF.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This joint resolution is the unfinished business. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the winter Olympic games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960, the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic



Committee to hold the 1960 Winter Olympic Games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif.; and expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

#### ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 218, House bill 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CAPT. MOSES M. RUDY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### BERNARDINO CANARES SACLO

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Bernardino Canares Saclo was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Bernardino Canares Saclo (A-9799304) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress under date of July 29, 1953, by Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, 83d Congress, 2d session.*

#### ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN ALIENS TO BENEFITS UNDER THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "Antonio Aikler"; on page 2, line 2, after the name "Bak"; to strike out "Wladyslaw M. Bareszykowski"; in line 7, after the name "Cielankiewicz"; to strike out "Stefan Ciundziewicki"; in line 13, after the name "Janowski"; to insert "Roberts Gustav Javals"; in line 15, after the name "Kaminski"; to insert "Sime Ivan Karlick (Sam Karlich)"; in line 19, after the name "Kotlarz"; to strike out "Piotr Kowalczyk"; on page 3, line 9, after the name "Pietrzak"; to strike out "Zbig-

niew Piotrowski"; at the beginning of line 22, to insert "Jan Srodulski"; and in line 23, after the name "Stubynski", to insert "Silvio Svagno."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the joint resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the joint resolution would permit the immigration authorities and the State Department to waive certain requirements with respect to entry at this time of certain individuals from Latvia and other Baltic countries, who came to this country without visas, but who are otherwise eligible to apply for an adjustment of status under the Refugee Relief Act.

The joint resolution would enable the immigration authorities to allow them to apply in this country for the benefits of the Refugee Act.

These persons are all bona fide refugees, but in the absence of the provisions of the joint resolution they would have to return to Europe in order to apply for entry. The joint resolution is not opposed by the immigration authorities or the State Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. This affords me an opportunity to bring to the attention of Senators a matter which was called to my attention yesterday. One of the prominent businessmen in my city of Minneapolis called at my office to tell me of a humiliating experience he has had to suffer as a citizen of this country because of some very unfortunate—and I think utterly ridiculous—rules and regulations pertaining to immigration. This gentleman was born in Ireland. He is a naturalized American citizen. He married a native of the United States in the city of Minneapolis. This friend of mine and his wife traveled to Miami, Fla., and from there went by plane to Habana. Returning from Habana, they arrived in Miami, the port of entry. When they arrived at Miami the customs officers announced: "All those who are native-born American citizens line up in this line. All those who are naturalized citizens line up in the second line. All others will line up in the third line."

My Irish-born friend is sensitive. He does not like to be separated from his wife by a bureaucrat or a customs officer under a law passed by Congress. Nevertheless, even though he has had 40 years of distinguished service in this country and is a prominent businessman of Minnesota, he is told by an officeholder of the Government of the United States, when he returns to the United States from a visit to the neighboring Republic of Cuba, that because he was born in Ireland and is a naturalized American citizen, he must be separated from his wife and stand in another line, while his native-born American wife takes her place in line No. 1 with other native American citizens. He is told, in effect, "Because you were not lucky enough to be born in this country, you must get into line No. 2. If you can find your wife in the Miami Airport later, that is all right, but you must get into another line."

I rise to protest that kind of shameful procedure under American law.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we are making a great many enemies by following another nonsensical procedure. I have been told about people coming to this country by plane from Norway, for example. After the plane lands, the last persons to be given customs examination by this Government are the aliens on the plane. In other words, a Norwegian, for example, may be traveling to this country with his brother, who is a naturalized American citizen of Norwegian birth. These two men may be traveling together from Oslo to New York. When they get off the plane at the United States port of entry, they are separated. They may not have seen each other for 20 years, and they are very happy to be together again, and they want to use every minute of their time for conversation. Yet our Government says to the naturalized American citizen of Norwegian birth, "You cannot come first in the customs line. Native American citizens come first. You go in the second line for American citizens." That man's brother, who is a native and citizen of Norway, is told that he will have to wait until the end.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, under our economy measures, we do not have a sufficient number of customs officials to take care of these people. Therefore, even citizens must stand in line for a long time. Such economy measure is similar to the one under which we are now saving money, it is claimed, by not printing new money. As a result, we carry around in our pockets old, beat-up dollar bills. It would cost only a few dollars to print new bills, but that is not done because we are trying to save money. Therefore we are carrying around with us germ-laden dollar bills.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. That is the kind of economy that is a little hard to understand.

However, Mr. President, I protest the indignity which we perpetrate upon good people. It is a shameful demonstration of American poor manners, and it is a lack of courtesy. Furthermore, it is disrespectful and, what is worse, rather stupid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### MAXIMILIAN KARL MANJURA

The bill (S. 88) for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

*Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maximilian Karl Manjura may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he*

is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

#### HEDWIG MARIE ZAUNMULLER

The bill (S. 430) for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### TOY LIN CHEN

The bill (S. 715) for the relief of Toy Lin Chen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toy Lin Chen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### IRFAN KAWAR

The bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Irfan Kawar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irfan Kawar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for a permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to this alien, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### KOSMAS VASSILIOS FOURNARAKIS

The bill (S. 1513) for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct

the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### ROSITA A. JOCSON

The bill (S. 1517) for the relief of Rosita A. Jocson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosita A. Jocson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### GARABED PAFAZIAN

The bill (S. 1521) for the relief of Garabed Papazian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Garabed Papazian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### CONSTANTINOS PANTERMALIS

The bill (S. 1581) for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Constantinos Pantermalis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### ELISEU JOAQUIM BOA

The bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that

such quota is available. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the deportation proceeding heretofore instituted against Eliseu Joaquim Boa as well as the order and warrant of deportation issued therein; and the said Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall not hereafter be subject to exclusion or deportation from the United States by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding order and warrant of deportation were issued.

#### GEORGE PAUL KHOURI

The bill (S. 1705) for the relief of George Paul Khouri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Paul Khouri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### ELSA LEDERER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 502) for the relief of Elsa Lederer which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elsa Lederer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMBROSE ANTHONY FOX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1035) for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Ambrose Anthony Fox. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Ambrose Anthony Fox shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which



such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Amrose Anthony Fox. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Amrose Anthony Fox shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. CONCETTA SACATTI SALLIANI

The bill (H. R. 872) for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Sacatti Salliani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ALBERTO DAL BELLO AND MRS. DINA BRISTOT DAL BELLO

The bill (H. R. 876) for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### GABRIELLA SARDO

The bill (H. R. 881) for the relief of Gabriella Sardo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. MOUNIRA E. MEDLEY

The bill (H. R. 886) for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. ELSA DANES

The bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ELISEO FELIX HERNANDEZ

The bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CHIA-TSENG CHEN

The bill (H. R. 921) for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HILDEGARD NOBLE

The bill (H. R. 913) for the relief of Hildegard Noble was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### GLORIA MINOZA MEDELLIN

The bill (H. R. 911) for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DR. DANUTA OKTAWIEC

The bill (H. R. 923) for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### JOSEPH MARRALI

The bill (H. R. 924) for the relief of Joseph Marrali was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HOWARD CARL KAISER

The bill (H. R. 958) for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. ERATO ARANOPOULOU

The bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. FRANCISKA MIHALKA

The bill (H. R. 976) for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DR. LYCOURGOS E. PAPADAKIS

The bill (H. R. 984) for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ALEXANDER TURCHANINOVA

The bill (H. R. 1008) for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### WILLIAM LIGH

The bill (H. R. 1009) for the relief of William Ligh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BORIS IVANOVITCH OBLESOW

The bill (H. R. 1020) for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CHRISTINE SUSAN CAIADO

The bill (H. R. 1048) for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. ANITA SCAVONE

The bill (H. R. 1130) for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FLORENCE MEISTER

The bill (H. R. 1166) for the relief of Florence Meister was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ZBIGNIEW WOLYNSKI

The bill (H. R. 1177) for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ANGELITA HABERER

The bill (H. R. 1192) for the relief of Angelita Haberer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LI CHU FU AND WIFE LEUNG SUE WA

The bill (H. R. 1196) for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife Leung Sue Wa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### IVAN BRUNO LOMM, ALSO KNOWN AS IVAN B. JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 1203) for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### KLEONIKI ARIGENDELI

The bill (H. R. 1220) for the relief of Kleoniki Arigendeli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. ANATOLY BATENKO AND VLADIMIR BATENKO

The bill (H. R. 1346) for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. LOTTIE LONGO (FORMERLY LOTTIE GUETTER)

The bill (H. R. 1351) for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetter) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### STYTIANOS HARALAMBIDIS

The bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of Stytianos Haralambidis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ANDREW HERNANDES MONTES ROCHA

The bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of Andrew Hernandez Montes Rocha was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ELIZABETH THALHAMMER AND HER CHILD, HAROLD WILLIAM BUSH-MANN III

The bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Elizabeth Thalhammer and her child,

Harold William Bushmann III was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**ROBERT GEORGE BULLDEATH AND LENORA PATRICIA BULLDEATH**

The bill (H. R. 1511) for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**JANIS ARVIDS REINFELDS**

The bill (H. R. 1638) for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**REGINA BERG VOMBERG AND HER CHILDREN WILMA AND HELGA VOMBERG**

The bill (H. R. 1645) for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children Wilma and Helga Vomberg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**DAVID MANUEL PORTER**

The bill (H. R. 1665) for the relief of David Manuel Porter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**MAREK L. KOROWICZ**

The bill (H. R. 1679) for the relief of Marek L. Korowicz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**ORLANDO LUCARINI**

The bill (H. R. 1885) for the relief of Orlando Lucarini was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**FAY JEANETTE LEE**

The bill (H. R. 1906) for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**NAMIKO NITOH AND HER CHILD, GEORGE F. X. NITOH**

The bill (H. R. 1957) for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**ERIKA RAMBAUSKE**

The bill (H. R. 2087) for the relief of Erika Rambauské was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**GUISEPPE CAROLLO**

The bill (H. R. 2261) for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CI—396

**VIDA KOSNIK**

The bill (H. R. 2276) for the relief of Vida Kosnik was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**SISTER MARY BERARDA**

The bill (H. R. 2279) for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**MRS. MARJORIE FLIGOR (NEE SPROUL)**

The bill (H. R. 2289) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**JOHN P. FARRAR**

The bill (H. R. 2346) for the relief of John P. Farrar was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bills to cancel the outstanding warrant of deportation in the case of John P. Farrar. The bill also provides that he shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which deportation proceedings were commenced.

The fact is, Mr. President, that John Farrar is an illiterate Portuguese who has been in this country working as a gardener on Long Island at a salary of \$500 a year since 1916. In 1946 he was charged with violating the law relative to the possession of marihuana. He pleaded guilty and served a sentence. It was ascertained that the whole difficulty occurred because he could not read or write, that he was isolated, unmarried, with no one around him, and he did not realize he had committed an offense. His deportation is pending.

The Immigration Bureau did not interpose any objection to the bill. Since coming to this country he apparently has been law abiding and his breach of the law was occasioned by ignorance on his part. Therefore, the Immigration Bureau does not interpose any objection. This is the only way by which they can be relieved of their responsibility.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I withdraw the objection I had interposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**THEODORA SAMMARTINO**

The bill (H. R. 2348) for the relief of Theodora Sammartino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**BASIL THEODOSSIOU**

The bill (H. R. 2354) for the relief of Basil Theodossiou was considered, or-

dered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**ELIZABETH ANN GIAMPIETRO**

The bill (H. R. 2361) for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**SING FONG YORK**

The bill (H. R. 2731) for the relief of Sing Fong York was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**BENT PETERSON**

The bill (H. R. 2762) for the relief of Bent Peterson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**VICTOR AND IRENE-WANDA GOLDSTEIN**

The bill (H. R. 2764) for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**MRS. ELFRIEDE MAJKA GRIFASI**

The bill (H. R. 2941) for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**MRS. IRENE EMMA ANDERSON**

The bill (H. R. 2954) for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**RENE RACHELL LUYSE KUBICEK**

The bill (H. R. 4043) for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**DR. CRISTJO CRISTOFV, HIS WIFE JORDANA DILOVA CRISTOFV, AND HIS CHILDREN GEORGE AND DAPHNE-KREMENA CRISTOFV**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 957) for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Diloova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "fees", to strike out "and head taxes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

**FEDERICO UNGAR FINALY**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the



word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

**NICHOLS JOHN MANTICAS, ANNE FRANCIS MANTICAS, YVONNE MANTICAS, MARY MANTICAS, AND JOHN MANTICAS**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1328) for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Yvonne Manticas"; and in line 11, after the word "deduct", to strike out "five" and insert "four."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas."

#### BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, with reference to Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; and Calendar No. 353, Senate Resolution 35, providing for a study of merchant marine training and education in the United States, I ask that those measures be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The measures will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

#### ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE ATOMS FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, when one pauses to reflect on this Nation's recent history, it seems incredible that what we have referred to many times as the cold war has been with us for nearly a decade.

In spite of the fear, the anxiety, and the tensions of the past 10 years, however, our people and peoples all over the world have shown a remarkable vitality and energy. We have learned to live with fear and, at the same time, to shape the tools for a better future for ourselves and our families. History will surely record the splitting of the atom as the most significant achievement in the first half of the 20th century.

Largely because of that momentous development we have come to refer more and more to the struggle between the free world and the Communist world as one of competitive coexistence. Slowly we are beginning to realize that another war, bringing with it a frightful rain of atomic destruction, would be suicidal for all of civilization. We are reaching the point of atomic stalemate. That fact can give us hope for the future. For while the issues of conflict still remain between the free nations and the Communist world, we can hope that atomic developments will act as a deterrent to the unleashing of a third world war.

The alternative to war is coexistence. But, so long as the Communist leaders are bent on achieving world rule, coexistence must remain strongly competitive.

The arsenal of American democracy has many weapons with which to carry on competitive coexistence. The most powerful weapon we have is our sturdy foundation of liberty and democratic ideals. We must be ever vigilant in the defense of those precious liberties and ideals. Only by practicing what we profess to believe can we convince others that we merit support in building the kind of world for which men everywhere long.

In addition to the right to live their lives in their own way, without outside interference, all men look for economic plenty—for a world in which they and their families are well clothed, well housed, and well fed. Here, too, the United States can exercise stirring and dynamic leadership.

Probably the most effective step which the United States has taken in this direction is the implementation of President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace program.

In the minds of many, America has emerged as a warm and humanitarian nation, interested in peace and plenty for men everywhere. The President's program to harness the atom for peace has done more than any other single action to strike a crippling blow at that Communist propaganda which paints us as a ruthless and warmongering people.

In August the United States will participate with many other nations at an international conference in Geneva to spread information concerning the peaceful uses of the atom. This Conference is the direct outgrowth of the suggestions made by the President before

the United Nations nearly a year and a half ago.

The United States has already made a contribution of 220 pounds of uranium 235 to an international pool of fissionable materials for use in encouraging our friends abroad to build their own research reactors. Our Government also plans to build an operating research reactor in Geneva for demonstration purposes at the Conference.

Meanwhile, negotiations are going forward on multilateral agreement which would set up an International Atomic Energy Agency to study new developments in the peaceful uses of the atom.

But this is only a part of the story of how the United States is helping to develop among our friends the technical know-how which can bring the blessings of atomic energy to all men. The Atomic Energy Commission has sent to Italy, Japan, and France comprehensive libraries of unclassified information on the atom, and more libraries are now being prepared for distribution to other friendly nations. Also, 2 of our schools are training 63 scientists and technicians from 29 nations under a Government program to speed the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Two weeks ago, President Eisenhower made the dramatic announcement that he would request funds from Congress for the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship which would visit the ports of the world, carrying with it an exhibit on the peaceful uses of the atom. That would be a fitting sequel, indeed, to the construction of the atom-powered submarine, the *Nautilus*. It would be conclusive evidence that our search for peace continues, even while we must remain militarily strong.

Much has been done and much more remains to be done in our efforts to bring the blessings of peace and scientific development to all men of good will. But President Eisenhower has made a dramatic and successful beginning. He has shifted the spotlight from the horrors of atomic war to the bright new day of atomic peace. He has shown the world that we stand ready to point the way to a better and happier life for all.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXPOSURE OF "PARTNERSHIP" POWER SCHEME OF ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in recent weeks many people with a sincere interest in the program for Columbia River Basin resource development have been led to believe that the beneficial objectives of river development can only be obtained through a "partnership" between the Federal Government and local utilities.

In effect, they have been told by the Eisenhower administration that the Federal Government will not carry through on these authorized projects which are so badly needed to control the floods which ruin their land unless Congress changes its mind and deauthorizes these Federal projects, turning over the profitable power features to local private utilities.

At the same time, a thoroughly false impression is deliberately created that under partnership these projects could spring into being overnight. This callous attempt to force Congress and the people of Oregon to accept a shotgun partnership is a type of political pressure hitherto unheard of on the American scene. Congress has the responsibility of repudiating the administration's pressure tactics.

Fortunately, some of the enlightened editors in my home State of Oregon have taken on the chore of airing publicly the disadvantages and adverse effects of the inadequate partnership proposals. One of the best analyses of the partnership scheme was written by Mr. Byron C. Brinton, editor of the *Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier*, in the April 28, 1955, issue of his newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Brinton's editorial, discussing the partnership proposals of this administration, printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### THE NEW JOHN DAY BILL

How much is \$100 million?

We refer specifically to the \$109 million bargain which the Portland private utilities would have walked off with had the Coon-John Day partnership bill of 1954 been swallowed. At that time the private utilities would have walked off with the power from John Day Dam for 50 years and we quote from the bill: "The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract with local interests providing for (a) the contribution of funds by such interests in the amount of \$164 million."

Under the bill introduced by Congressman Coon at the instance of President Eisenhower and the Portland private utilities last week, the power syndicate would walk off with the 50 years contracts and we again quote—this time from Coon's 1955 bill: "The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract or contracts with qualified applicants . . . providing, among other things, for (1) the payment of funds by such interests in the amount of \$273 million."

In cold hard reality Coon offered a \$320 million dam in 1954 for \$164 million. Other than President Eisenhower, Secretary McKay, Governor Patterson, and a few others, spearheading the Eisenhower giveaway program, there were not many suckers for this private utility scheme in 1954. Now Coon says the utilities are bidding \$273 million for a \$310 million dam. Yet he recommended in 1954 that you and I accept \$164 million.

In 1954 this writer summarized 10 cardinal points—other than the matter of hard cash—which characterized the Coon partnership bill as the most dangerous piece of financial hokus-pokus ever proposed in Congress. An analysis of the 1955 bill reveals that the new bill puts up a warning sign that the depths of its monopoly manipulation go far deeper than even his former bill dreamed.

Let's look at the blind, dark alley the Coon bill leads the Northwest into.

First. Mr. Coon tells the local county assessor he shall not tax the \$273 million. But he didn't tell you in his analysis of the bill.

Second. Mr. Coon tells the State of Oregon it cannot impose the provisions of its hydroelectric act upon his pet private utilities at John Day. Yet he didn't tell you that also is contemplated under the bill.

Third. Mr. Coon tells the private utilities they need not distribute the power widely with preference to residential or rural customers nor in compliance with low-cost provisions of previous power policies. Yet Mr. Coon didn't tell you that was part of the bill. In fact he purposely spoke of the "widest distribution to domestic and rural customers" to purposely mislead the public.

Fourth. Mr. Coon tells the private utilities they can assign, barter, speculate in, and otherwise deal in their power contracts between each other without the slightest control by the landlord himself—the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Coon doesn't tell you in his analysis that each private utility holds this automatic option upon the other partner private utilities so that the monopoly can grow tighter but can never be broken. The alley is not only dark and blind but is a one-way gangplank.

Fifth. Mr. Coon tells the private partners he hands them a blank check upon Uncle Sam for "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." Nowhere is there a specific guaranty that the partners will pay any sum, but clearly there is an agreement that they will receive 100 percent of the power and most specifically that "the contracts provided for herein shall be deemed contractual obligations of the United States Government" even though this bill prevents the Congress from having any surveillance over the project or the contracts. Yet Mr. Coon has the nerve to casually remark to you in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* that this provision on obligations "makes the obligations of the United States rank equally with those assumed by the local interests."

Sixth. Within 6 months after enactment of the bill 99 percent of the public agencies, and perhaps 100 percent, in the Northwest would be disqualified from participation in the project yet he tells you that "the important thing is who is served—not by whom he is served."

Seventh. Mr. Coon does not reserve John Day power—not a kilowatt—for national defense. He does not tell you that his bill will require that national defense buy it back from private utilities.

Eighth. Mr. Coon tells the private utilities that certain costs at their option may be paid in equal installments over a 50-year period at low-cost Federal interest, but he leads you to believe in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* that all the money must be advanced before the power contracts can be executed.

Ninth. Mr. Coon grants the private utilities with the contracts not only a monopoly upon the present John Day development, but grants them an option upon all future generators at John Day, even though those added generators might be made possible by future public upstream storage projects.

Tenth. Mr. Coon tells the private utilities they can have the franchise for 50 years, yet he tells you "the John Day project will be a Federal project in all respects."

Eleventh. Mr. Coon tells the private utilities they are not bound but that the Federal Government is bound to his bill—the bill provides that if John Day turns out to be an expensive project the partners will not pay a nickel, but that if engineers find that it will be a bargain the public will be obligated to contract it at that bargain figure to private utilities. Mr. Coon doesn't tell you this is a "heads I win, tails you lose" bill.

Twelfth. Mr. Coon directs the Secretary of the Interior to deliver for 50 years power equal to that generated by the initial facilities. However, the operation by the Army of the project as part of a river system may sometimes be less than the partners will contend they are entitled to under contract. Whatever happens to the dam, the private stockholders hold the contract. And this is an obligation of the United States.

Thirteenth. The Coon bill does not require the project to be integrated with the Northwest power system. It does not require that the power be subject to the rate supervision of that system. It provides for the charging of rates on the basis of risk capital under conditions where there is no risk involved.

But Mr. Coon does not tell you that in return for the public subsidy, the public contract, the freedom from taxes on the power facilities, the freedom from risk, the low Government interest on much of the investment, the freedom from rent, the freedom from competition his bill doesn't require a single thing in return from the power companies and it guarantees the power consumer nothing.

What in reality it does is give \$1,270,000,000 worth of power for possibly \$273 million—and if Mr. Coon would have had his way in 1954 he would have given it away for \$164 million.

And in the bargain Mr. Coon tells the utilities if they can get \$3 billion in high rates out of the million dollars' worth of power that's O. K. with him. After all, even \$100 million isn't much if it belongs to John Q. Public.

#### ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is Calendar Order No. 218, House bill 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call that fact to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, H. R. 1573 was, of course, passed by the House of Representatives, and I understand it was passed unanimously, and it also was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I might modify that statement by saying that two or three members of the committee were not present when the bill was ordered to be reported. As to whether they were recorded affirmatively or negatively, I would not say, but all members of the committee present voted in favor of H. R. 1573.



This is a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which section, commonly known as the Holland amendment in the act of last year, denies soil-conservation payments to producers who violate their acreage allotments.

Prior to last year section 348 applied only to cotton producers. Last year Congress extended it to producers of all basic agricultural commodities in the hope that it would bring about increased compliance with acreage allotments. It now appears that, instead of accomplishing this purpose, it is resulting in decreased participation in soil-conservation programs. It has caused particular difficulties in the case of farmers who are exempt from marketing quotas but subject to acreage allotments, such as wheat producers planting less than 15 acres, tobacco producers who have voted down quotas, and others.

This bill was the subject of careful inquiry by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which subcommittee it was my privilege to be chairman. Other members of the subcommittee were the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, in his letter to the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER], dated February 9, 1955, called for the elimination of section 348. I should like to read a passage or two from Mr. Morse's letter to the Senator from Louisiana:

The Department approves of this proposed legislation.

This was at the time the bill was before our subcommittee. I continue to read from Under Secretary Morse's letter:

The Department approves of this proposed legislation. At present the only ACP payments made are for cost sharing with respect to conservation practices carried out on farms, and these payments represent only a share of the cost of performing the conservation measure. There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists. Also, the present average ACP amount of cost sharing of less than \$100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

The principal effect of this restriction—

Namely, the Holland amendment—

on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms. Since it is expected that most farmers will comply with marketing-quota provisions, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will affect principally farmers with corn allotments and farmers with less than 15-acre wheat allotments. Under marketing-quota requirements a farmer with a wheat allotment less than 15 acres is permitted to grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without incurring a marketing-quota penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the ACP eligibility requirement of section 348.

The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, continues as follows, in his letter or report to the committee:

Based on past experience that there will be about 750,000 farms with a 1955 wheat-

acreage allotment of less than 15 acres. A high percentage of these farms is expected to take advantage of the 15-acre limit and thereby become ineligible for 1955 ACP assistance. It is estimated that there will be 1,600,000 farms with a 1955 corn allotment. Based on the compliance obtained in 1954 it is likely that up to 60 percent, or almost 1 million farms, will have excess corn acreage in 1955 which would make them ineligible for 1955 ACP payments. Even though some farms with small wheat allotments also grow corn and would be included in both of the foregoing estimates, it is likely that substantially more than 1 million farms would not be eligible for ACP payments, due to the provisions of section 348.

Elimination of this entire requirement of eligibility is desirable. Its repeal would not require additional appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,  
Under Secretary.

Mr. President, at the time of our hearings, we were privileged to have the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Earl L. Butz, appear before us. He presented a letter to the subcommittee; and, later, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Peterson, also testified in behalf of the Department.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Butz, in his letter of March 10, to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], had this to say:

Since the passage of Public Law 690, farmers have been expecting to be permitted to adjust their planted acreage to come within the allotment on each basic crop if they so desired. To change at this time, with respect to the 1955 crop, would lead to much dissatisfaction, misunderstanding, and administrative difficulty in connection with some crops, particularly corn and rice.

The Department believes that the provision for adjusting the planted acreage to the allotment should be applicable equally to all the basic commodities. In our opinion the provision in the present law should be retained.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,  
Acting Secretary.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that not only did the Department of Agriculture support the particular change we are recommending, but furthermore, the National Farmers Union supported it, as did, I believe, the National Grange. No objection was registered, with the exception of one from the American Farm Bureau; and its objection was not an across-the-board objection, so to speak. It wanted some modification of the present provisions of section 348, but did not wish to go so far as the committee ultimately decided to go.

I do not believe much more need be said regarding the bill, except that the Department of Agriculture was contacted only recently, in light of the fact that I had heard that amendments would be offered. I wish to read the statement reaffirming the position of the Department of Agriculture:

After careful additional review and analysis by the Department of the proposal to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Ad-

justment Act of 1938, as amended, we wish to reaffirm our position that this section be repealed. While the amendments proposed—

That is to say, the amendments which I gather will be proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other Senators; and it is to those amendments that the Department of Agriculture is directing its attention in this memorandum—

while the amendments proposed by Senator HOLLAND with respect to certain technical objections which we had to this section are generally met, nevertheless, we feel that there should be no relationship between eligibility for ACP payments and participation in an allotment and marketing quota program. In view of the fact that marketing quotas are in effect for all basic commodities except corn, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will, even after amendment, affect principally those farmers with corn allotments. Also, there will necessarily be a tremendous amount of administrative detail. In view of the principle involved and the discriminatory nature of the present legislation, we recommend repeal of section 348.

Mr. President, strange as it may seem, I am hereby presenting an administration proposal. This is a unique position for me to occupy, but I am doing it with a certain amount of pleasure and with deep conviction.

I am confident that the Department of Agriculture has found that section 348, as now written, is a hindrance to an effective soil-conservation program, rather than a help to the so-called acreage-and-production-quota program.

Therefore, the Department and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recommend the repeal of this section, as proposed by the pending bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. If the bill shall be passed, is it not altogether possible that the soil-conservation program will be stimulated, rather than hampered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the view of the Department of Agriculture. In that connection, I called attention to the letter of the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Butz, and also the testimony before our subcommittee of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Peterson. It was felt that the present limitation does nothing to strengthen acreage allotments and production quotas, but has substantially weakened what we call the participating program in soil conservation, by means of which the farmer and the Government work together in the soil-conservation program, particularly in the case of the family-type farms. I believe we must view this matter on the basis of what is best for soil conservation.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not also true that the law provides appropriate penalties in cases where they are applicable, anyway?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; it does.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As I recall—and perhaps the Senator from Minnesota will wish to refresh my recollection—the bill is not only supported by the Department of Agriculture and two of the large farm organizations, but also is supported by the committee. I believe it was unanimously approved by our committee. I know it was unanimously approved by the subcommittee, and I believe it was unanimously approved and ordered reported by the full Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, although with certain reservations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I qualify my statement by saying that I believe 1 or 2 members of the committee were absent, but were polled. It is correct that all members of the committee present or polled voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. As additional support for that position, let me point out that at the bottom of page 4 of the report will be found a list of a large number of Members of the House of Representatives who have introduced bills along the same general line. Included in the list are members of the House Committee on Agriculture, as well as other Members of the House of Representatives; and they are rather evenly divided as between the two political parties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, let me point out that a number of Senators have introduced similar bills.

Mr. MUNDT. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For instance, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] introduced such a bill on January 6; and similar bills were introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. In the committee there was some discussion as to whether we should report a Senate bill on this subject; but in order to expedite the taking of action by the entire Congress—in view of the fact that immediate repeal of this provision is important for farmers, in connection with their planning of soil conservation—we determined to report to the Senate the House bill, and thus expedite the passage of the proposed legislation. However, I think it should be clear that the Senators who sponsored separate bills on this subject had in mind the same objective. In fact, several of the bills are in identical language.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

I should also like to say that I wish to join with the Senator from Minnesota in urging our colleagues not to endeavor to load up this little corrective amendment with any other amendment at this time, for this is something which it is necessary for us to do soon and quickly if the maximum benefit is to be had.

So I hope nothing which would result in further delay on the House side will be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD the name of the witness representing the Department of Agriculture who appeared before the committee. He is the Honorable Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. The Acting Administrator of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, Mr. F. G. Ritchie, also appeared.

If my colleagues will examine pages 7, 8, and 9 of the hearings, they will find that Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Peterson unqualifiedly endorse this particular program.

Mr. Ritchie was asked by me:

Have you thought that the operation of section 348 has impaired or impeded in any way your ACP program?

That was the question I asked the Acting Director of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Ritchie responded to my question as follows:

I believe it has, as it applied to these crops, such as corn and wheat, particularly. We find a good many farmers who come to the county offices to see about getting cost, sharing under the ACP on the conservation work that they would like to do. We have to inform them about the provisions of this section of the act, to be sure that they are not misled and go ahead and do their work and then find themselves ineligible for ACP help. A large portion of them, when they find that they have to comply with all of the allotments, decide that they will just forego the conservation activity.

Listen to this:

So we feel like it is deterring the achievement of conservation, out of proportion to the benefits that it is getting in causing these farmers to comply with the allotments.

That answers the question of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. Mr. Ritchie says:

So we feel like it is deterring the achievement of conservation, out of proportion to the benefits that it is getting in causing these farmers to comply with the allotments.

Then I asked the following question:

Senator HUMPHREY. In other words, the penalty is not sufficient to get compliance under the allotment, but the loss of the benefits under ACP could in some way retard some of your efforts in soil conservation?

Mr. RITCHIE. That is correct.

Later we had the testimony of Mr. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. As I have stated, Mr. Lynn took a little different point of view. This is what he had to say as his concluding statement:

May I conclude by saying that I recognize that the Department of Agriculture has recommended the repeal of section 348 and that we are the only witness recommending the continuance of section 348. We would certainly hope that the committee would give serious consideration to this particular section. If it seems advisable to amend this section to do what I suggested before, to take care of these smaller farmers who need to put out enough corn to fill their silo, or the small wheat farmer who needs to plant enough wheat for his own home consumption, up to 15 acres, we would support an amendment to section 348 to so provide.

Even the Farm Bureau Federation recognizes that the present provisions of law are undesirable, in the sense that they do not strengthen production con-

trols, and do not provide for improvement in soil conservation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish first to clear up any question as to the support of this measure in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have no doubt that the statement which has been made, that the members present voted to report House bill 1573, is correct. However, several members of the committee were not present. Upon the table there is a printed amendment, in the nature of a substitute, submitted by three members of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], former chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], former Secretary of Agriculture, and the senior Senator from Florida, in which they are joined by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. Three of the four authors of the substitute amendment are members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and we were not in accord with the bill as originally introduced and as reported. Instead, we have submitted a substitute which we think would effectively clear up the difficulties mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, and not cripple the enforcement of the price-support program in the way it would be crippled by the enactment of the proposed repeal measure.

The second thing I wish to say is that, while this amendment bears my name, and I am proud to have it bear my name, the fact is that the amendment is a product of the thinking of the American Farm Bureau Federation, as reflected in resolutions adopted by it last year, and also last December, at the last annual convention. The Farm Bureau Federation of my own State likewise is very strongly in support of the amendment.

What did the provision which is sought to be repealed by the pending measure do? It enacted, in a weakened way, a provision of law with reference to all basic commodities, which had been effective as to cotton, one of the basic commodities, continuously since 1933, without doing violence to the producers of cotton, but, to the contrary, with the accomplishment of sound objectives by way of closer adherence to the allotted acreages than was found in the case of some of the other great industries, notably the corn industry.

In 1933 the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was enacted. I think all Members of the Senate will recall that it was held unconstitutional in 1936. Up to that time a single measure dealt with the entire field of price support, conservation, and other objectives in this field designed to bring greater prosperity to agriculture.

Under the system of rental and benefit payments which prevailed under that act, the linking together of the conservation payment and the price-support structure was effectively accomplished.

After 1936, immediately upon the ruling of the Supreme Court that the original AAA Act was unconstitutional, Congress enacted, within a few weeks, the original Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, which was the first exclusive conservation measure in this field.



Under that measure as well, with reference to cotton, the same provision was applicable. In 1938 that measure was reenacted in more perfect form, and a part of the act of that year was section 348, which Congress amended last year. It has been in force continuously since that time.

Let me read section 348 in the act of 1938, which applied solely to cotton. I omit certain words which are unnecessary in giving the full meaning of that section:

Any person who knowingly plants cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be eligible for any payment under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

From 1938 until last year, 1954, that provision was in force. Not only did no harm result from it to the hundreds of thousands of producers of cotton in the United States, but a better performance in living up to acreage allotments was accomplished by the cotton industry than was found in some of the other industries, in which no such provision applied. I think the record shows very clearly that the cotton industry is one of the great industries which has not cost the American people heavily under the price-support program or the soil-conservation program. To the contrary, cotton farmers have stood by their guns. They have stood by each other, and have stood by the Department of Agriculture and the Nation in very strictly observing their acreage allotments. Without doubt, this particular section played some part in that strict observance.

When the measure was before the Senate last year, as Senators will recall, a situation was presented in which we were endeavoring to save a price support program, with little reductions, at most, for any commodity, and with no reductions from the 90 percent price support program in the case of commodities of which no great surpluses were created—in other words, commodities the producers of which imposed self discipline.

At the time of the consideration of that measure I offered on the floor the amendment which extended section 348, which had been in force since 1938 as to cotton, so as to apply to all basic commodities, including cotton.

In re-writing the amendment at that time we made it a weaker provision, but we thought a fairer provision, than that which had been contained in the original section 348, because the original section 348 provided that if a grower knowingly over-planted he should forfeit his right to soil-conservation payments.

As we rewrote the provision in the bill last year, we used the words "any person who knowingly harvests." That made it possible for him to adjust his acreage throughout the period of production, in the event he found that he was over his allotment, or in the event there was some trespassing upon his allotment next year.

The form in which the measure was enacted last year is one of the things, it seems to me, that operates as a road-block in our present discussion, and it seems to me that possible support for

the measure, which is now under consideration, comes from those who opposed the bill of last year.

Perhaps the three Senators who gave the strongest or most active support to the enactment of the bill last year were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], and the senior Senator from Florida. We were proud to give that support. We are not found in support of this repeal measure because we believe it is a salutary thing to provide that the Government shall not, out of one of its pockets, pay money to growers to whom it is offering a very generous program out of another pocket, when such growers refuse to play fair to the second pocket, although they share in the governmental payments from the second pocket which continue in such large measure, in so many billions of dollars. That is how simple it is.

If a grower wants to play ball with his fellows and with his own Government and with the people of the Nation, who are providing funds so generously in order that there may be some stability in his industry, he should at least be willing to be fair enough not to trespass upon the acreage allotments which are given him, and which represents his fair share of the total amount available for his industry. It seems to me that is a fair condition to impose upon him, namely, that he shall observe the provisions of the price-support program, as made applicable to him through his acreage allotments, if he is to hold out his other hand and ask the Federal Government to pay largess for carrying on practices which are good for him, and which, as a rule, he should carry on regardless of whether anyone contributes to the cost of the program.

I do not have a great deal more to say on this subject, except that I wish to voice some disappointment with the fact—and it is a fact, as stated by the Senator from Minnesota—that apparently the Department of Agriculture is willing to blow both hot and cold on this matter. It blew very hot last year, when, with the support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and of a majority of the membership of both Houses of Congress, as well as a preponderance of the American people, Congress enacted a program which was designed better to serve agriculture and to retain price supports for certain commodities.

We are sorry that the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to leave us, its advocates of last year, and to take the position that repeal of this provision should now be accomplished.

We are particularly sorry that the Department sees fit to base its position upon something which cannot yet be demonstrated at all, namely, that the provision is crippling the conservation program. The provision did not become applicable until the first of this year. No payments under it can be made until the end of this year. No one knows yet what will be done under it. If one reads the testimony carefully, he learns simply that certain farmers, when informed of this provision, have said that they would rather go ahead and violate

their acreage allotments than participate in the soil conservation program.

Mr. President, what I say now I say in complete good humor. So far as I am concerned, if any farmer wishes deliberately to violate the acreage allotments which the Government has prescribed for his protection and for the protection of his fellow farmers and the agricultural industry, I am willing to have him abandon his right to claim money from the Federal Government for pursuing on his land practices—sound practices, I may say—which he ought to be willing to pursue in protection of himself and of his own land and its values, even without Federal assistance.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if there may not be 2 or 3 situations which might possibly be corrected by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad that the Senator from Utah has made that suggestion. The 4 Senators to whom I have already referred have prepared a substitute which corrects the only 4 embarrassing situations we could find lending support to the arguments advanced by the Department of Agriculture. It corrects them entirely without repealing the salutary provisions contained in section 348.

It seems to the Senators who are offering the amendment that what the sponsors of the bill would have us do is to cut off our good right arm because we happen to have a hangnail on one of the fingers, instead of giving detailed and specific attention to the hangnail.

The amendment which we have prepared was submitted to the Department of Agriculture; and the Department of Agriculture, through its Under Secretary, Mr. Morse, admitted to me no later than this morning that it would correct the difficulties of which the Department is cognizant, although he reiterates that it was the preference of the Department of Agriculture that section 348 should be repealed entirely.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota to withhold his question until I have read into the RECORD the proposed amendment, in the nature of a substitute. It proposes that the measure shall read as follows:

SEC. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests an acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

So far as those words go, that is exactly the language of the present provision. Then we add four exemptions, which comprise all the exemptions so far as we could hear any statement made by anyone that should be made in the revision of the act.

Before I read the four exemptions, I think I should say to the Senator from Minnesota and to other Senators that I believe they will recall that the measure of last year was rewritten in conference; that this particular provision did not come out of conference in the same wording in which it was submitted on the floor and debated on the floor, and that in rewriting the provision in conference there were omitted some of the details, which it now appears should have been included.

I read those four exemptions as follows:

For the purposes of this section, no person shall be deemed to have harvested any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity in excess of his farm acreage allotment by reason of harvesting corn for ensilage, harvesting wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres, harvesting a commodity or a crop with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a marketing-quota referendum, or harvesting peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

"Hogged off" is not a very euphonious term. It is used in the peanut belt to denote the harvesting of a crop of peanuts entirely by turning in the hogs and letting them follow their natural instincts by going after the luscious nut under the ground. They are very thorough harvesters, if I may say so.

The problems covered by these four provisions, Mr. President, were the only ones, with the exception of one covered in a later modification of the bill which I shall read, which we were able to find from one end of this country to the other in which the amendment as written in the present law offers any difficulties whatsoever.

The first was with reference to farm acreage for the production of corn harvested for ensilage; that is, to go into silos to become feed on the farm for dairy cattle or livestock, or not to be used in connection with any marketing.

Second. The harvesting of wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres. There is a marketing quota provision which allows the harvesting of 15 acres of wheat without penalty. Judging by the letter from Mr. Morse or by the testimony of Mr. Peterson, if there is any strong feeling at all on the part of the Department of Agriculture, it is that they are fearful that if a farmer whose actual allotment may have been 5 or 10 acres planted, despite his allotment, up to 15 acres, he might have to come under this provision. I think that is a highly strained construction of the law. But whether that is so or not, the substitute as prepared would correct that situation.

The third is the harvesting of a commodity or crop with respect to which the producers have rejected marketing quotas in a referendum. That speaks for itself.

The fourth is the harvesting of peanuts for seed for hogging-off purposes. There are many peanut producers who raise peanuts simply for the purpose of fattening their hogs. Some of those producers felt they should be allowed to grow peanuts for seed in order that they might go ahead with their program.

Mr. President, those were the only four situations which we could find and which the American Farm Bureau Federation could find from one end of the country to the other which required any special treatment under the act to make sure they would be exempted so that no unfair result could come to them under the provisions of the act.

There was likewise a matter of procedure which proved to be burdensome and which we chose to correct by subdivision (b) of the proposed substitute, which reads as follows:

(b) Persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be required to establish their eligibility for such payment under this section in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation.

That paragraph would give the Secretary the authority to issue regulations which would make it unnecessary to send out notices to every farmer, even though he could not possibly be affected, and would save an enormous amount of office work which under present regulations would be required, and which I understand from the distinguished Senator from Vermont are actually required in his State, although there was no direct implication in the law that it affected the growers of his State.

So, Mr. President, we think that the substitute is by all means the sound method of approaching the problem, rather than the repealing of a provision which is salutary and which we think is on the side of decency in that it prescribes that a farmer who claims largess from the Government through his conservation payments must at least play fair with his Government and with other producers.

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall wait to get the floor in my own right.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Florida. I shall wait until I can get the floor in my own right.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, after listening to the Senator from Florida today, and having heard him previously, I am convinced that he is correct, and that the amendment is a sound approach to the problem. I recognize the fact that there are difficulties in connection with the four categories which he has mentioned. But I think they could be completely corrected by the amendment which he has prepared. I was hoping that it would be offered and that we would have an opportunity to discuss it on its merits. I am very happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has made an outstanding record with respect to agriculture in the United States since he entered the Senate. I am glad to go along with him in support of his amendment.

It is very inconsistent, indeed, for men who operate farms, large acreages, who

take conservation help and use fertilizers to increase their output, to ask the Government of the United States to give them compensation benefits when they do not comply with at least the spirit of the act.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah. I certainly agree with him completely. The questions involved must be decided, whether my amendment is actually offered or not. I have been disappointed and discouraged in connection with the idea of offering it, because I learned a long ago that it was sort of a futile gesture to hand a gun to a man who would not fight, or to give a tool to a man who would not work, or to present a program to a man who will not use it. I believe that good, firm leadership in this field would lead to a correction of some of the manifest abuses in connection with surpluses which have been piled sky high in the warehouses of the Nation and in the ships which were empty before they were filled with surplus products. We have all been looking for some method of disposing of those surpluses. Many methods have been suggested, and I should like to think most of them are wise. But we are still struggling under those immense surpluses. As I recall the latest report shows a billion bushels of surplus wheat. I do not have in mind the exact amount of the surplus of butter and milk products. But the surpluses are so great as to baffle any solution that has ever been suggested along the line of having them consumed by human beings. As a matter of fact, we have actually turned to chickens and cattle to consume great amounts of dried milk.

Mr. WATKINS. I am a farmer, in a small way, particularly with respect to the raising of fruit, but I never could see a sound policy in any law which provided aid from the Government for doing what I was already doing and had been doing for a number of years, such as fertilizing the orchards. I think that applies all down the line. It seems to me that if the program is unreasonable it is going to be difficult to continue to sell it to the American people, particularly if we continue to allow these absurd situations to develop.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. I think all the public-opinion polls which have been conducted in urban areas or in areas where perishable agricultural commodities are produced, and in other areas of the Nation, have shown rather conclusively that the general public was pretty well "fed up" on the program under which we were operating until last year. I think the public is hoping that the program we adopted last year will be given a fair chance to be effective. I cannot imagine anything which will be more discouraging than to have word go out—and it must go out if this bill is passed—that instead of strengthening the program, we are actually weakening it.

I repeat: The provision as to cotton has been in effect throughout the duration of the law, and it has proved to be a salutary provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?



Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

I cannot imagine anything more discouraging and disheartening to persons who are looking hopefully to balanced budgets and to industries which will more or less stand on their own, though I fully agree that as to the basics and as to some other products we must have some support-price program, than to learn that the White Knight who led them so hopefully to higher ground last year has begun to be a little fearful as to whether he can lead successfully. I think it will be a most disappointing and discouraging experience.

Speaking only for myself, as one of the strong advocates of his program last year on the floor and elsewhere, a program which was mine before he came into the picture 2 years ago, it is discouraging to me to find a suggestion in the report that there is no connection between the conservation program and the price-support program. To that subject, I shall devote a little further attention in a moment.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate what the Senator from Florida has been saying. He had been giving a very accurate résumé of the situation with which we are confronted.

When anyone says there has never been any connection between the ACP program and controls, he is simply incorrect, because there has been such a connection for years past.

In view of the fact that the amendment which the Senator from Florida and others of us have proposed exempts from the provisions of section 348 the small wheatgrower, who has no voice in the determination of whether he shall be placed under controls or not; inasmuch as it exempts the dairy farmer, who grows corn for silage, and does not market his corn anyway; inasmuch as it exempts peanuts, which are "hogged off" if planted in excess acreage, or perhaps are kept for seed; inasmuch as it relieves State officials who are concerned with soil conservation from sending questionnaires to hundreds of thousands of farmers who are not affected at all or who do not produce basic commodities for marketing anyway; does it not then appear that the only possible reason for insisting upon the bill as reported by the committee, rather than the Holland amendment, would be to give the green light to the corporation farmers, the large farmers, to go ahead and plant in excess of their fair allotment without incurring the penalty provided by section 348?

Is not that the only possible reason anyone could have for voting for the bill as reported instead of for the Holland amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. That certainly is one of the very persuasive reasons. I think there is another reason, as to which the Senator from Vermont and I might not be in complete accord, having to do with an event which will occur in November of next year. But that I shall waive for the moment.

I thoroughly agree with the position taken by the Senator from Vermont to

the effect that the bill, if enacted as it is now before the Senate, would simply play into the hands of the large, mechanized farmers who are already producing at a unit cost very much less than that of the family farmers; and it would put every Member of the Senate who votes for the bill in the position of going further and further toward the stamping out of the family-type farms and the removal of the protection which now is accorded to family-type farmers, and which, under our proposed substitute, would be generously extended to all the small wheat farmers, all the small corn and dairy farmers, and all the other groups which the Senator from Vermont has mentioned.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will permit me to say so, if things in a certain political party continue to go as they appear to be going at this time, I am not so certain that there will be much disagreement between the Senator from Florida and me in November of next year—and I am not referring to the Republican Party.

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated, when I reverted to that question, that I did not expect to find the Senator from Vermont and myself in complete accord when we got into that field. I have not been disappointed in his reaction to it.

But certainly, with the exception of the point which he has strongly made, the other point which I have suggested—and I have only suggested it—is about the only other argument I can see for the passage of the bill.

Speaking only for myself, and not from a partisan standpoint, I should dislike greatly to think that the Secretary of Agriculture, whom I have found to be highly nonpartisan in his approach to problems, had another approach to this particular problem. I am simply regretful that he is surrounded apparently by advisers who, I think, have carried him into strange lanes and alleys in the reaching of the conclusion which he appears to have reached as to the pending bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As a result of oral discussions with some of the officials of the Department of Agriculture, I have come to the conclusion that although they are reluctant to reverse the position which had previously been taken, or even to modify it, they would find it highly possible to apply the law equitably and fairly, as intended by Congress under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida and other Senators. I feel certain they will not say they could not apply the law fairly; but when he has once taken a position, we know how reluctant any bureaucrat is to change that position, or even to modify it.

I agree with the Senator from Florida that in the Department of Agriculture there are certain persons, acting in an advisory capacity, who sometimes give the Secretary what we might call a bum steer.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is unfortunate that the distinguished Secretary of Agri-

culture has not had the time—and he cannot possibly have the time in this or any other matter—to master all the details himself, because I have great confidence in his integrity, his soundness of conscience, and his desire to serve all the people and all the producers in any agricultural group. I simply differ with him very strongly in the soundness of the conclusion to which he has attained; whether by guidance or by thinking of his own, I am not able to say.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the Senator from Florida agree, too, that we must be watching the entire principle underlying farm programs in the United States? I am certain the Senator is aware of the reports which have been circulating to the effect that the wheat growers this year may vote down controls. I believe the Senator is aware of the unrest which is developing rapidly in the cotton growing areas, and of the growing demand on the part of cotton growers that they be permitted to run their own business, to recover the markets they have lost during recent years, and to prosper under their own steam.

Furthermore, if I may add another point, I think one clear red light, or at least caution light, which was lit before us in the last 2 weeks, was the spontaneous vote by a substantial majority, in the House of Representatives last week to throw peanuts completely out of the list of basic commodities.

Though the House came back into line later, I suspect that some Members felt the sting of the whip. However, a program cannot be operated forever with a whip.

I think we should take warning from the fact that consumers also have taken an interest in what is going on, and that the next time a commodity is voted out of the law, as peanuts were, it will probably stay out.

I think we should take heed that if we have a program, the way to make the program permanent and successful is to make it work, and not to give a green light to violators and would-be violators.

Certainly the Holland amendment overcomes the weaknesses of section 348. There were weaknesses in that section. I admit that. I know it now. But if it is desired to go beyond that, if it is the intention to say to the corporation farmers, the wheat farmers producing on 1,000, 2,000, or 5,000 acres, "Go ahead and overplant; you will get your money just the same," we will be inviting trouble for farm programs generally.

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not more thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I think we would be inviting not only trouble, but also disaster of the most grievous sort, if we took a step of that kind at this time, when the program voted last year, including the portion of it now under discussion, is just going into effect. I may say that the Senator from Florida has tried to show rather clearly his understanding of the fact that some of the producers in some agricultural industries are going to be finding much difficulty this year. I joined in increasing the estimate of the Department of Agriculture for the ACP program from \$195

million to \$250 million solely because I thought that there ought to be a little heavier cushion. I want to have that cushion. But, Mr. President, I do not want to have available a cushion which will depend for its availability upon excesses and abuses and violations on the part of the individuals who receive acreage allotments, and who I think, in decency and in honor, ought to observe those allotments if they expect to participate in the ACP program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Florida a fact of which I am sure he must have become aware from the letter of the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, True D. Morse, which appears on page 2 of the report, in which he says, without equivocation of any kind: "The Department approves of this proposed legislation"—period.

I notice that the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry questioned the wisdom of the Department of Agriculture in making that decision, and figured perhaps it reached an erroneous conclusion. In that event, I wonder if perhaps the Senator does not consider that the Department of Agriculture, which he feels could be wrong now, might not have been even more wrong a year ago, when it was recommending, along with the distinguished Senator, the abandonment of the 90-percent price-support program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that inconsistency could not be chargeable to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota because he was wrong last year and he is wrong now. Those who are supporting the pending bill are the ones who opposed the salutary program of last year, including my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Dakota.

If I could hear those who were strong advocates of the price-support program last year come forward and say, "Here is something to make the present program work better," I would be very much comforted. But though I have listened intently, I have not heard the first comment from a Senator who took such a position about bringing into sounder perspective the whole price-support program.

Mr. MUNDT. What we are trying to do is to correct, at least to a minor degree, some of the major mistakes of those who last year supported a change in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Since the Senator has adverted to the statement of Mr. True D. Morse, I should like to call attention to the fact that the middle sentence in the very paragraph from which the Senator from South Dakota has read does not hold up. That sentence reads:

There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists.

I have had this matter up, in some detail, with the Solicitor's office of the Department of Agriculture, and it has

been admitted to me that they could not point to a law under which that change was accomplished.

Furthermore, it is quite clear to me, and I think it will be to my learned friend, the Senator from South Dakota, that not only has there been the closest kind of interlocking between the two programs from the first year's legislation until now—and I am going to mention the various steps in a moment, if I may—but in the last two appropriation bills there is specific requirement providing for the interlocking of the two programs in the action of the Department of Agriculture in spending their soil-conservation appropriations.

I hope the distinguished Senator from South Dakota will follow me while I repeat a provision from the current compilation issued by the Department of Agriculture in Agriculture Handbook No. 79 of January 1, 1955, containing, among other things, all the provisions of the Agricultural Appropriation Act of last year. I read this provision:

That in carrying out the 1955 program—

That is the one under which we are working now—

the Secretary shall give particular consideration to the conservation problems on farmlands diverted from crops under acreage-allotment programs.

Not only were the two programs interlocked already by provisions which are contained in the legislation which established them—and I am going to mention them in a moment—but the Senate and also the House, in the passage of the appropriation bill last year were so fearful that the Secretary of Agriculture would not understand that these two programs were interlocked and were interdependent and should be administered together, that these words were placed for his guidance in the appropriation bill, and I read them again:

That in carrying out the 1955 program the Secretary shall give particular consideration to the conservation problems on farmlands diverted from crops under acreage-allotment programs.

Of course, we all know it is because of the diversion of more than 30 million acres, under the retracted programs of the last 2 years, that people in certain agricultural industries have gotten into the great straits they are in.

The appropriations measure pending in conference has practically the same words in both the House and Senate versions of the bill. The matter is not in conference now. I read now from the House print of the measure as it passed the Senate, including the Senate amendments, and this was not a Senate amendment:

Provided, That in carrying out the 1955 program—

Now we are looking ahead to the next year—

The Secretary shall give particular consideration to the conservation problems on farm lands diverted from crops under acreage-allotment programs.

So it is clear that not merely last year, but this year again, the whole membership of both Houses of Congress

has understood clearly what apparently whoever wrote the letter which came to the committee from the Department of Agriculture did not understand that there was a careful interlocking of identity, interest, and objectives between the two great programs. So in giving instructions on the expenditures of, I believe, \$195 million last year, and this year of \$250 million, we have included specific words requiring that the conservation program shall be given impetus in its efforts to take care of diverted acreage which has been made available by acreage-allotment programs in the price-support program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has described the relationship of two general, overall, parallel programs, but he has not referred to any language in the statement of Under Secretary True D. Morse to the effect that there is a recommendation by the Appropriations Committee that soil-conservation-program payments be held up as a penalty. That is the point at issue.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The members of the Appropriations Committees, along with other Members of both the Senate and the House, joined in enacting legislation last year which is found in section 348 of the bill passed last year. The provision became applicable to each basic crop. That particular provision was contained in the law ever since 1938, and in the law generally since 1933, as it applied to cotton. So there was no moment when it was not true that these two programs were interlocked, and it was recognized to be so.

If the Senator will bear with me, I may refer to one section of the law which affects price supports, coming down from the wording of the law of 1948, at the time when it was first sponsored by my distinguished friend from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN]. It was also contained in the soil-conservation measure coming down since 1938, without any change whatsoever. Each of the provisions made it as clear as it could possibly be made that each particular subject, soil conservation on the one hand, and price support on the other, was always to be considered as part of the other program, and that the two were to be regarded as always interrelated.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator were to search for one statement in Mr. Morse's testimony about the relationship of the two programs, I think he would study long and in vain to find any place in the parallel evolvment of these two programs where it is indicated or implied that one program should be used as a club for securing performance of the other program. That is what we are objecting to.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator could not be more in error because, since 1938, it has been specifically in the law, and I shall read it again. I read it before the Senator was able to



reach the floor. This provision has been in the law since 1938:

Any person who knowingly plants cotton on his farm in any year in excess of the farm acreage allotment for cotton for the farm for such year under section 344 shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Therefore, it was not a matter of harvesting but of planting. That provision has been in the law and has been enforced as a part of the law. It has been accepted and lived under by the cotton industry, which has a fine record of performance. When one looks at the other industries he will not find such a record of performance.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I was interested in the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Florida, in which the question raised was as to whether or not the entire repeal of the provision would help only corporation farmers and large farmers. In North Carolina there are many very small farmers who raise corn, for instance. They do not make ensilage from the corn. They gather it and shuck it, and then feed the corn to hogs. Under the proposal now made, if such farmers exceeded their acreage by even one stalk of corn, they would lose the benefit of any payments coming to them under the conservation program, would they not? That is my question.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. If they knowingly harvest more than their allotment, and they are given a chance to have a check made not only by themselves but by the local agency, the county agency of the Department, and they do waive their right to soil-conservation payments.

Mr. ERVIN. If they knowingly gathered one additional stalk of corn growing on some of their land, they would forfeit their right under the soil-conservation program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator making a statement?

Mr. ERVIN. I will put a question mark at the end of my statement. Is not my statement correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The statement is correct if there is a harvesting after there has been a chance for measurement, and after measurement has been made. Then the farmer who has harvested more than he is permitted to harvest—unless he is one who has ensilage which he can use on his farm—has forfeited his soil-conservation payments.

That would simply put on a parity the fine North Carolina farmers who produce corn with the producers of cotton, who lived happily under a similar provision for years, although one which was stronger because it simply provided that if they planted more acreage, they forfeited their right to soil-conservation payments. They have lived very happily under that provision since 1933; and, so far as I know, no complaint about it has reached the committee.

Mr. ERVIN. But why penalize the corn farmer who feeds his corn to hogs?

He can plant corn and put it in his silo and avoid any penalty, whereas if he feeds the corn to his hogs, he will forfeit the soil-conservation benefits.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the farmers of North Carolina are no more resourceful than that, I would say that might be the result. But having observed agricultural operations in North Carolina, where the farmers have silos and also have underground storage and other types of storage structures, in which corn can be stored, I do not think there is any serious reason for the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to be disturbed.

On the contrary, I would feel that the Senator from North Carolina would think it only simple justice to require that at long last the producers of corn get their house in order, just as the producers of cotton—of whom I would say there are perhaps several hundred thousand in North Carolina—have cheerfully and effectively lived up to their acreage allotments, and have done a fine job in that connection.

Why should not the corn farmers—the neighbors of cotton farmers, in many instances—be just as cheerful about accepting such requirements, by adhering to the law and to the regulations, as are the cotton farmers?

Mr. ERVIN. Then would it not be advisable to extend this principle a little further, and provide that a farmer must not only obey the acreage allotments, but must also obey the Ten Commandments, if he wishes to receive his soil-conservation payments?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina may have some jurisdiction in that field, but I have not claimed any such jurisdiction. I would not even attempt to say to the good people of my State of Florida what they should do in regard to obeying the Ten Commandments, much less have the effrontery of attempting to tell the free Tar Heelians what they should do in that field. I enjoy too much my visits in North Carolina on my way to and from my own State to attempt to do anything which would jeopardize my welcome there, where I hope to travel immediately after the adjournment of Congress, while I am on my way home.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me point out that normally in North Carolina many farmers grow wheat and feed it to chickens. If such a farmer grows one grain of wheat more than the amount he can produce from the 15 acres, he would also lose the benefit of any soil-conservation payments.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe the growing of one additional grain of wheat would cause him to forfeit anything.

Mr. ERVIN. As a matter of fact, if a farmer exceeds his allotment, he already is subject to a penalty under other laws, is he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Under some, but not under others. I do not believe that is so in the case of corn.

Mr. ERVIN. This proposal would result in two punishments for the same offense. The farmer would be placed in jeopardy twice for committing one offense, would he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would not say that. In the case of some of the basic commodities, there is no penalty at all for overplanting.

Mr. ERVIN. But in the case of most of them—the major ones—there is a penalty.

Mr. HOLLAND. How about the planting of corn? Does the Senator from North Carolina understand there is a penalty in that case?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; I understand that a commercial-corn farmer is subject to penalty in case of overplanting.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina represents in part a State which does not have the markets to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, because the corn produced in our southland is consumed there, and not marketed.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; some of the farmers in North Carolina feed the corn to hogs, and do not sell it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I yield, let me repeat that the farther we proceed, the clearer it becomes that the Senators who advocated the passage of the pending bill are the very ones who did not want a good, sound price-support law enacted last year, and fought very hard against it. In fact, some very unkind persons have, in referring to the efforts of those Senators, used the word "filibuster." I was not among that number; but I have not yet heard anyone admit any objection to the position taken by the four Senators in their substitute amendment—except those who, last year, very ardently opposed a realistic coming to grips with the problems of the Nation in the field of agriculture and an attempt to get our agricultural production under control.

I yield again to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I point out to the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate has already, without objection, passed a bill which would exempt the chicken producer of North Carolina from any penalty whatsoever if he produces more than 15 acres of wheat, so long as he uses the excess for his own feeding purposes. The bill is now pending in the House, and we hope it will be acted upon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very grateful to my friend from Vermont for making that comment which, of course, is true. I think it should also be said that in various States which are not in the commercial areas of production, the farmer is completely exempt from any application of these laws, both as to wheat and as to corn.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have a couple of additional questions to ask.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there not a bill before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which would add six States

to the noncommercial area? I am pretty sure North Carolina is one of such States, which would be exempt from penalties.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is such a bill, but I cannot say whether or not North Carolina is one of the six States.

Mr. AIKEN. There are six such States. I know that Georgia is one of them, and there are five others.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Vermont has referred to a pending bill. A pending bill is like the hope of salvation. It may not come to pass.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from North Carolina continues to advert to a field in which the Senator from Florida is not an expert, but he accepts the comment in good faith.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that it would be no fairer to subject the dairyman producing corn for his silo to the penalties of the act than it would be to subject him to penalties for producing clover and other leguminous crops, which are equally rich in nutriment, for the same purpose of putting them in the silo?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senators who joined in the substitute amendment, including both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Florida, felt that such was the case.

Mr. AIKEN. The dairyman ought not to be subjected to a penalty for producing silage corn, any more than for producing clover and other crops.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have one further question to ask the Senator from Florida.

Is it not a fact that, if the Holland amendment were rejected and the bill in its original form passed, the only persons who could possibly benefit from such action would be those who intend knowingly to violate the law?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is entirely correct. The so-called Holland amendment, which is the American Farm Bureau Federation amendment in the act of last year, affects no one who does not knowingly abuse his Government's generosity, his fellow producers, and the American public in general, by knowingly exceeding his share of the production capacity.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. During the colloquy with the Senator from Vermont the Senator from Florida referred to proposed legislation which the Senate passed earlier this year. It also passed Senate bill 46, which was reported on March 23, legislative day of March 10.

At that time certain products were exempted. Wheat was exempted, provided the wheat was not removed from the farm, but the entire crop of wheat was used for seed on such farm, and so forth, and provided also that such producers complied with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

I wonder whether the amendment the Senator now proposes to superimpose on Senate bill 46 would cause us to back downhill from the action on Senate bill 46, by limiting those provisions, once again, to 15 acres.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; that would not be the case. The bill as it now stands would back down the hill from the position we took last year in the effort to bring about greater compliance with acreage allotments and a higher degree of compliance on the part of producers of all basic commodities except cotton. This regulation had already been applicable to producers of cotton.

We passed section 348 last year. We would back down the hill most ingloriously, in my opinion, at a time when all the people of the Nation expect us, in good faith, to try honestly to make the program adopted last year work, if the pending bill as it is now written were enacted.

I recall that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER]—and he is an able and distinguished Senator and chairman—was quoted in the public press only 3 or 4 days ago to the effect that he would not permit to come up in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year a measure which was barely passed in the House of Representatives the other day, and which would operate to negate the fine effort we made last year, without ever giving the program a trial. He was quoted as stating that he would not permit it to come up this year, because he felt that the program ought to be given an opportunity to demonstrate its value. With that statement I completely agree.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say, first of all, that I hope the Senator from Florida does not pin too much hope on the rather impetuous remark made by the chairman of our committee, on the spur of the moment and before he had an opportunity to canvass the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It may very well develop that there are votes enough in that committee to force action and consideration on the floor of the Senate this year, when the measure can be considered as an economic asset, rather than to wait until next year, when it would be pure political buncombe.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota is, of course, entitled to his own opinion in that respect. However, I invite his attention to recent developments in the so-called Eastland subcommittee. The report of that subcommittee would indicate that instead of losing support in the Senate for the flexible price-support program and all the other reasonable features in the bill passed last year, we are gaining adherents.

Again, the Senator from Florida says that he has no right to speak for any other Senator. The Senator from Florida does not know what will develop when the question arises. But when the chairman of a great committee, a Member of many years' experience in the Senate, a Senator who is known to have fought very hard last year against a flexible price-support program, announces publicly to the press and over

the radio that he believes that the country will expect a reasonable opportunity to be afforded for the performance of that program, and that, therefore, he does not propose to call up this year the proposed legislation to which reference has been made, I think more than mere passing comment should be made upon his statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that if my friend, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, has any hope of being able to have reported this year from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the measure of which we speak, he probably has not given as earnest attention to the subject as I believe he will give before he makes any effort in that direction.

Mr. MUNDT. Being a member of the Republican Party, of course, the Senator from South Dakota is a little more dedicated to the concept of individual responsibility, and less dedicated to the concept of leadership, in contrast to members of the opposition party.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me comment upon that statement.

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is a very estimable chairman—

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to reply to the Senator's last statement.

Mr. MUNDT. I thought the Senator from Florida had yielded to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to reply to the Senator's last statement.

I point out that last year, when there was pending on the floor of the Senate a Republican program for price support and for better control of the agricultural production of the Nation, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has referred to himself as a Republican, did not see fit to support that program. At least, that is my recollection. If I misquote the distinguished Senator, I hope he will correct me.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. That confirms the point I make, that, as a Republican, I am a little more dedicated to the concept of individual responsibility than to the leadership concept, which has done so much to injure the great Democratic Party during the past 20 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. As applied last year, I thought it looked more like individual confusion, particularly when it showed up in the position of the Senator from South Dakota and his conferees who, in spite of strong and excellent leadership in the White House, and in spite of strong leadership from the Department of Agriculture—which, I regret to say, is somewhat weakened—and in spite of strong leadership from very conservative farm organizations such as the Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, the two cooperative organizations, and others, voted on the other side. I believe the only farm organization on the other side was the Farmers Union, and that certainly is not a Republican organization.

The Senator from South Dakota saw fit to make his bed with the Farmers Union and with the other groups I have



mentioned, instead of following what I thought was strong and constructive leadership, which happened to come from the Republican Party. I did not think the Senator was demonstrating completely, to the satisfaction of all who watched, the soundness of his Republicanism. If the Senator is coming to a different conclusion, of course he is entitled to it, and I shall not question it, because he knows what is in his innermost thoughts. However, looking at his votes of last year, I conclude that he and the Farmers Union and a few others were trying to run in one direction while the Republican Party and a good many Senators from this side of the aisle were proceeding constructively in the sound direction in which we were able to make some progress.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize my great disadvantage in trying to say anything if the Senator continues to cut me off every time I stop to take a breath.

Mr. HOLLAND. I apologize.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, the Senator has that right, and if he insists on asserting it, I must struggle along as best I can. First let me refer to the last point the Senator made, the one about my Republicanism. I have already stated that as Republicans we hold to the doctrine of individual responsibility, as opposed to the doctrine espoused for the past 20 years by Senators on the other side of the aisle, which is a form of the European leadership concept, under which the "I am" principle is dominant and under which premiers and leaders of state gain undue control over their people and over the members of their political parties.

However, the point I am trying to make about my Republicanism is that in the State of South Dakota the State Republican Convention—the great convention of that great party of that great State—after due and careful investigation and hearings, endorsed the program of 90-percent price supports, and has continued that position consistently. Therefore, it seems to me to be an economic problem rather than a political program.

What started this interesting colloquy, as I remember, was the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that there would be no vote in that committee on this issue this year, although next year might be the appropriate time for it.

I think there is abroad in the land the thought, which I believe originated in Democratic headquarters, that 1956 will be a better time for voting on the subject of agriculture than 1955. Perhaps that is true from the standpoint of politics. Certainly it is not true from the standpoint of the farmer, if a particular program has merit.

I share completely with the Senator from Florida his admiration for the capacity, and courtesy, and leadership of the chairman of the committee. However, I have never been able to find any correlation between efficiency on the part of the chairman of the committee

and his accuracy as a prophet. The Senator from Florida and I know that we have never polled our committee. We do not know how the members of the committee are going to vote. We have the same membership on the committee we had last year, with one exception, namely, that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] has replaced the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CARLSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall continue to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. I do not wish to cut him off. I was grieved by his suggestion that I had cut him off when his wind was just starting up in good shape. I certainly do not want to do that again.

Mr. MUNDT. There is nothing I would rather not do than grieve my delightful friend from Florida. But I should like to make one other comment in connection with the Senator's earlier statement, when he and the Senator from Vermont were having their congenial colloquy while leaning on each other's shoulders and finding much to support in their amendment. The Senators became quite enthusiastic in their exchange of views. However, as is the case in such situations, we sometimes let our adjectives outstrip the facts as they are incorporated in nouns and verbs. It was under such circumstances that the Senator from Florida said, I believe, that the great beneficiary of the bill would be the large-scale farmer, or the corporate farmer, rather than the family-type farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my complete conviction.

Mr. MUNDT. That being true, it grieves me to find the distinguished Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] so hopelessly in disagreement with the Department of Agriculture, with which they found themselves so happily in agreement only a year ago. I say that because in the letter of Mr. Morse, from which both of us have read, each of us skipping lines here and there to find something pleasing to our point of view, Mr. Morse said:

The principal effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope that—

Mr. MUNDT. I say that as a rejoinder to what the Senator from Florida has stated about corporate farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am grieved that the Senator did not continue his reading. If he had done so, he would have made clear, as I shall do now, that the statement quoted corrected by him from the letter from Mr. Morse is followed by two illustrations of defects, both of which are admitted by the proponents of the substitute amendment, and both of which would be cured by the substitute amendment. I continue to read at the point where the Senator from South Dakota stopped his reading:

Since it is expected that most farmers will comply with marketing-quota provisions,

the eligibility requirement of section 348 will affect principally farmers with corn allotments and farmers with less than 15-acre wheat allotments.

Those two situations would be corrected by our substitute amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. That statement by Mr. Morse could not be said to apply to corporate farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I continue to read:

Under marketing-quota requirements a farmer with a wheat allotment less than 15 acres is permitted to grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without incurring a marketing-quota penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the ACP eligibility requirement of section 348.

That is cleared up by the substitute amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The next paragraph has to do with corn, and the Senator will find—and I shall not read it in full—that in the long paragraph which immediately follows, the distinguished Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Morse, made it quite clear that his troubles come from small farmer situations in the wheat and corn industries, both of which are cured by the proposed amendment. Therefore that statement in Mr. Morse's letter becomes completely inapplicable in the event the substitute amendment is adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have not alleged that Under Secretary Morse was criticizing the substitute proposal as being designed principally to take care of the big farmer. What I said was in the form of a rejoinder to the statement by the Senator from Florida, that H. R. 1573 would be helpful to the corporate farmer and injurious to the family-type farmer. I think that is clear from the record and from the paragraph the Senator has read.

I also believe that Mr. Morse is accurate when he says that the principal effect of the restriction has been to discourage conservation on family-type farms. It is possible that the amendment would also correct that evil. However, it is not fair to say that our suggestion is conceived to help the big farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The substitute clears up the question entirely with reference to the small-type farmer. It restricts the field of application of the bill entirely to the large type of operation. I am sure that the Senator would agree that section 348 should be applied to the large operations. We want to leave the law so that it can be applied to the farmer who has many acres and a great deal of machinery and operates an industry. However, the insistence of the Senator from South Dakota and his associates, all of whom were opponents of the farm bill last year, that the pending bill must be passed as is, means that instead of taking a substitute measure which cures the defects of the law as it affects the small farmer, they seek the passage of a measure which gives unbounded advantage to the big farmer. The Senator from Vermont was com-

pletely correct in calling attention to that fact a few minutes ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not deny the right of the corporation farmer to have friends and to have his views presented on the floor. However, that is not what I wish to query the Senator from Florida about. Permit me to say that during the first 2 years I was a Member of the Senate I was very much gratified to find that farm programs were not made matters of partisanship. There was no partisanship until a few years ago when efforts were begun to inject politics into the question. I wish to say that American agriculture should not be used as a football for either party politics or political philosophy. I have found among the Democrats some of the staunchest supporters of sound farm programs, not only Democrats in the Congress, but Democrats throughout the country who are leaders of farm organizations. Among them I have found no more staunch supporters of a free and prosperous agriculture and sound farm programs than are the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wanted to make that statement to clear the air. I know those Senators will never agree to put American agriculture under the complete domination of government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to commend the Senator from Florida, as I have many times previously, for his staunch position in behalf of conservation. But since the question of family-size farms has come into the discussion, I should like to suggest that the amendment which the Senator has offered and in which I have been honored to join with him, as has the Senator from Vermont, is, in my opinion, designed to make it possible for conservation payments to continue and for family-size farms to continue.

If the record needs to be made more clear, we can read off item after item which the able Senator from Florida has supported when, in his judgment, it would make possible prosperity for the average size farm. His constant support of measures designed to remove huge surpluses is exemplified in the recent act to provide for the removal of surpluses. But the greatest help we can give to the family-size farm is to provide prices by which the farmers can live on their farms and make a living, and not have to depend on Government subsidies.

I commend the Senator from Florida, as I have many times before.

I should like also to commend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for saying that he has not believed in putting these matters on a basis of partisan politics. I can testify that in 1948, when the President of the United States sent to the Congress a bill providing for flexible price supports and for an entirely new price-support program, the man who took the bill and carried it to the floor and saw it pass on the floor of the Senate was a Republican—the Senator

from Vermont—who did not ask what the label was, whether it was a Republican label or a Democratic label, but only whether it would be of assistance to the farmers of the Nation.

I commended his attitude then, and I commend it now. I am happy to be associated with the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico, who, before being a great Senator, was a great Secretary of Agriculture. I know of no person who better understands the problems of agriculture and what is required to make it more stable and more prosperous than does the Senator from New Mexico. It has been a great pleasure to me that my own very strong and longtime convictions have arrayed me on the side of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I listened to the debate with the idea of opposing the Holland amendment, but the distinguished Senator from Florida has led me to believe that he may be on sound ground, after all.

With reference to the repeal of section 348, the inquiries I have received have been from small farmers with respect to their being able to participate in both conservation payments and the price-support program. As I examine the amendment, it leads me to believe that it does not meet all the objections with respect to section 348. Was it not the purpose to eliminate that provision?

Mr. HOLLAND. Undoubtedly, the purpose of those who introduced the bill was to repeal entirely section 348. Based upon the hearing and upon the conference with farm organizations, particularly the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Senator from Florida and his associates who have offered the substitute have found that the situation can, in their judgment, be cleared up entirely as to the small farmers by the adoption of the substitute and still leave in the bill section 348 to prevent large mechanized farms from exceeding their acreage quota with impunity and making it even more difficult for the small farmer to continue to live.

In taking up the measure with the Department of Agriculture, we find that they feel they are obligated to continue their stand for outright repeal. They have said to me that if enacted, the substitute amendment will cure the various defects it seeks to cure, and will, they think, be workable, and that they will be very happy to attempt its enforcement.

Mr. Morse still feels that outright repeal should be had. The attitude of the Department is not unanimous on that point, however.

Mr. CARLSON. The last statement of the distinguished Senator assures me that they have gone into that feature of it. The mail which I have received has not been from large corporation farmers, but from small farmers who were having difficulty in qualifying for soil-conservation payments. If the Senator from Florida will assure me that they will be

protected, I shall have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. In my judgment, it would completely take care of their complaint.

I should like to invite attention to the statement of Mr. Peterson, which appears on page 7 of the hearings:

We believe it desirable that persons receiving benefits under one program not be in a position to defeat the purposes of other programs.

Then he goes on to say:

However, the provisions of section 348 as it now stands, we believe, are not particularly effective in accomplishing the intended purposes.

What we have tried to do is to change section 348—and the Senator knows it had to be rewritten in conference—and to put it in a form which meets the five difficulties which we were able to discover which might possibly exist if the language of the act were enforced as it now stands. We believe those difficulties would all be cured and removed, leaving section 348 still applicable. We believe this effect is needed by the large producers as well.

I have repeatedly invited the Senate's attention to the fact that the same provision has been salutarily applied to the cotton industry ever since the beginning of the program, with the result that it has kept cotton acreage closely in line, as compared with other commodities which have not had such a restraining influence.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

I will complete my remarks hurriedly.

There was some question about the tying together of the two programs. I stated that as to each of them, from the beginning, there have been provisions which tied them to each other. In the beginning, there was only one act, the act of 1933, which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1936.

That act was followed in a few weeks, first, by the Conservation Act of 1936, which was reenacted in 1938. One of the provisions of that act has been in existence all the time as section 348, which applied, as to cotton, to anyone who knowingly planted—not harvested, but knowingly planted—more than his allotted acreage. If he did, he lost his right to claim his ACP payments. That was a tying together which was clear and inescapable.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely this language is proper for the protection of the farmer, because the farmer might plant acreage and not have measured it quite accurately. When the county extension agent, or whoever was doing the measuring, came to the farm, he might say, "You are entitled to only 4 acres, but you planted 5."

The farmer could then say, "Well, I had my planting device set to measure, I thought, accurately, but it was not." All the farmer has to do then is to refuse to



harvest from the extra acre, and he will incur no penalty under the law.

We have had such a provision for cotton production for years past, and it has caused no damage. If the cotton farmer planted so much as 1 foot beyond what he was authorized to plant, he could be subject to a heavier penalty. This is a far more liberal provision. So surely, if the cotton provision has caused no trouble in 17 years of operation, there is no reason why the proposed provision should cause trouble, liberal as it now is.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, who is a cosponsor of the amendment. He will remember that the provision in the present law was completely rewritten in conference. It was the intention of the conferees, in rewriting it, to make it more generous from the standpoint of the individual farmer.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly the situation. When the difficulties were pointed out, the Senator from Florida took the position, time after time, that he wanted to make this a liberal provision, and not a tight provision, and he hoped the Department would so administer it that it would not be an extremely restrictive provision.

I know the intention of the Senator from Florida is that we should make this useful in the program. But if we are not careful, we will see several of these programs, which we now think are good, suddenly begin to disappoint.

In areas of the United States where tobacco is planted the limitation is as exact as seven-tenths or six-tenths of an acre, and those who plant tobacco will be tempted to use a very poor measuring device when they plant a very limited crop of that nature.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct.

I have already mentioned that section 348, throughout the life of the Conservation Act, has effectively tied together the two programs, namely, that of acreage allotment and soil-conservation payments. As to cotton, there is no question about that. That is a fact.

I now point out that one of the principal objectives stated in section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as it was enacted in 1938—and that provision is in the act as we speak here today—is to reestablish the purchasing power and to give greater value to the commodities the farmer produces on his own farm.

I shall not read all of section 7, but I shall read the applicable portion, leaving it to any other Senator to insert any other portion, if he sees fit to do so. I begin at the first part of section 7, as follows:

(a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purpose of the act shall also include—

Now I shall quote the fifth objective—reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on

farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909–July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio.

It is completely clear, therefore, even to the most casual reader, that the objective of the soil conservation law is identical with the major objective of the price support law, which named the base period and contains largely the same language, because the provision comes from the price-support legislation. I have read it because it ties the two programs together.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Florida that the bill which the Senate is now considering is a very simple one, designed to correct a specific defect, for which purpose various methods are being suggested.

The bill passed the House on March 2. It is now almost the middle of May. I think it is important that the bill be passed.

I wonder if the Senator from Florida would not consider withdrawing his amendment at this time and presenting it to the committee, where hearings could be held, and the committee conceivably could support the amendment if it has the advantages which I know the Senator feels it has.

If the amendment were to be added to the bill now, the result undoubtedly would be a long conference with the House of Representatives, during which other amendments could be made by one device or another.

The committee could consider the amendment and have a hearing on it. The calendar of the committee is pretty well up to date.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota, but it is not in accord with my own thinking on the matter at all. I am anxious to have continued in the law the salutary portions, of which there are many, of the section of the act passed last year, to which we have made reference, namely, section 348; whereas the Senator from South Dakota apparently desires to invite the nonacceptance of acreage quotas and the violation of acreage quotas wholesale by farmers throughout the Nation, with impunity, if the provisions of the bill should be enforced, insofar as the right to continue to collect ACP payments is concerned.

I do not join with the Senator from South Dakota in that objective. I do not think it is a sound one. I think it would be very hurtful to agriculture. Agriculture is struggling now to preserve its good name.

My observation has been that a great many people are becoming very restless and impatient with those leaders of agriculture, whether political or otherwise, who might feel that agriculture has a free ride to prosperity at the public expense, regardless of whether it is willing to put any power of discipline on itself or not.

I do not subscribe to that kind of approach. I think the better elements in

agriculture have always been willing to discipline themselves. They now know perfectly well that the good will of the Nation is hanging in the balance on the whole subject, and that it is important for agriculture to show its willingness to play the game according to the rules. That is all we are asking to be done.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the consideration which the Senator from Florida gave to my suggestion. I am frank to say that I offered it with more hope than confidence. While I am disappointed in its rejection, I am not dejected. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

Our colleague on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who was here earlier, seeking to engage himself in the colloquy, had to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, because some North Dakota witnesses were present. The Senator from North Dakota has now returned to the floor, but he must again go back to the committee momentarily. Therefore, I would appreciate it if the Senator from Florida, if he is of a mind to do so, would yield to the Senator from North Dakota, so that he might ask his questions now.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to do so. I regret that I did not find it possible to yield earlier.

As I recall, I had agreed to yield, but the Senator from North Dakota had to depart; he could not wait.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not desire to ask questions; I seek the floor in my own right.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for the purpose of allowing him to make his statement, with the understanding that I may resume the floor in my right when he has finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, every time a farm bill of any kind comes to the Senate floor the wheat farmers in particular have to take a beating. The impression is left that they are law violators and are trying to get some money from the Government for nothing.

The bill we are considering today will have little effect upon my State. According to the Department of Agriculture's own letter, the bill will affect mostly farmers producing corn and less than 15 acres of wheat. I assume that to mean that it will affect the smaller farmers in the eastern part of the United States.

The Department of Agriculture says that this provision, as written into the law last year, does great injury to the family-type farmer. That position is supported by the grange, one of the oldest, probably the oldest, of all farm organizations, and by the National Farmers Union. If there is merit in the amendment being offered today, I cannot understand why it was not offered in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This amendment does have far-reaching consequences, and I

am sure the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is operating most expeditiously, could consider the amendment in a very short while and take action on it. We have been doing that this past year. We did it last year. I do not know of any bill of this nature which was held in the committee any length of time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to remind the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that when the bill was ordered reported the Senator from Florida was not present. He was appearing before a House committee with a delegation from his State. The Senator from Florida asked for the right to be heard; the committee did not see fit to suspend action on the bill until he could get there; and the only way the Senator from Florida can be heard on this matter is to present the substitute now.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it would have been better for the Senator from Florida to ask that the bill be sent back to committee. That could have been done, and the bill could have been reported back in 2 or 3 days.

Mr. President, I think the letter of Under Secretary True D. Morse to the chairman of the committee has a great deal of significance and should be read into the RECORD. The letter reads in part:

The Department approves of this proposed legislation. At present the only ACP payments made are for cost sharing with respect to conservation practices carried out on farms, and these payments represent only a share of the cost of performing the conservation measure. There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists. Also, the present average ACP amount of cost sharing of less than \$100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

The principal effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms.

Mr. President, I think Under Secretary Morse is right in that respect, and I do not think the law should be loaded down with amendments which would tend to destroy the ACP program and the Conservation Act.

I have heard many statements made this afternoon about the present price-support program. Those statements were made by Members of the Senate who come from areas outside the area that produces most of the basic farm commodities.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida and to the Senator from Vermont that the most rigid price controls and regulations we have in the United States are those affecting milk, and fruits, and vegetables. Certainly under the present milk orders, prices have been held at a rigid level over a long period of time.

Try as he might, no midwestern farmer can get a quart of milk into the New

York or Washington market, or other eastern areas.

When Senators speak of people getting tired of some of these farm programs, they had better include such programs as I have just mentioned along with the programs under discussion and which have been so roundly criticized. In my opinion, programs affecting milk producers and producers of fruits and vegetables as well as basic commodities, are operating to the great benefit of both consumers and producers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, unfortunately, some of us who are members of the Appropriation Subcommittees have hearings scheduled for the afternoons during legislative sessions of the Senate. Thus we are denied the right to remain on the floor. If we do remain on the floor, we forfeit having the benefit of a great deal of testimony in the Appropriation Committee, when we should not be absent.

I have just returned from room F-39 in the Capitol. This afternoon we had before us representatives from the Navy Department testifying with reference to various appropriations which relate to their department. I could not be absent. I have been in that committee hearing from 2 o'clock practically up to the present time, and the committee just concluded this afternoon's hearing.

I come to the floor to find tension in the Senate amongst Senators representing various segments of the agricultural economy of the United States. Senators are somewhat tense, and their feelings are tense. They have been debating this subject this afternoon. I do not know just what charges have been made against the farm-support program; but I sense a feeling of tension in the Senate Chamber, as I stand here now, and I sensed it as I came to the Chamber a few moments ago.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no room for such tension among these Members of the Senate, some of whom represent agriculture in the deep South, some of whom represent agriculture in the Northwest, and some of whom represent agriculture in the central part of the Nation. We must confer with one another and must determine how best we can serve agriculture. We need to put our shoulders to the same wheel, so to speak, so that we shall be able to get the farmers out of the rut they are in.

I am disturbed because of the fact that in 1947 the farmer was receiving 54 cents of each dollar the consumer spent for food, whereas the last information I have obtained from the statistical section of the Department of Agriculture shows that today the farmer is receiving only 42 cents of each dollar the consumer spends for food, and that probably that amount will decrease to 41 cents. On the other hand, the consumer has not gained in the slightest—not even to the

extent of a fraction of a penny—by way of any decrease in the prices he pays for agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, if during the last month the farmer received only 42 cents of each dollar the consumer spent for food, then we know that someone else is receiving the difference between the 54 cents the farmer formerly received and the 42 cents he now receives; the situation is simple. Since the farmer is receiving that much less, and since the consumer is not receiving the difference, where is it going? I ask that question, and I wish to have all my colleagues ponder it.

Each one of us should put his shoulder to the wheel and should confer with his colleagues, and should make every effort to determine how we can regain for the farmer a little of what he formerly received from the consumer's expenditures for food. If that cannot be regained for the farmer, then we had better make sure that the cost of food to the consumer decreases, inasmuch as the consumer is entitled to lower food prices if the farmer is not to receive the benefit of the increased prices charged for the commodities he produces.

Mr. President, House bill 1573 should be passed without extensive debate. House bill 1573 is a proper bill and a good bill. It would rectify a situation which is destroying good, sound soil-conservation practices throughout the land. The bill was introduced in an effort to correct the improper action taken by Congress last year, insofar as good farm practices are concerned.

It is my position that any attempt to amend House bill 1573 would be improper, if it attached to the bill a provision which would cause it to be burdensome, and would result in having Members of the Senate vote against it for the reason that the bill then would carry an amendment or rider which would thwart our attempt to repeal a particular section of last year's amendments of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—a section which, in the course of a year's experience, has been found to be detrimental to the proper practice of soil conservation under a sound program.

So, Mr. President, I hope the debate on House bill 1573 will soon come to an end and that soon the Senate will vote on this measure, which should be enacted promptly, so as to repeal the restrictive provision to which I have referred, which has a tendency to destroy the fine soil-conservation program which, over the years, we have been endeavoring to perfect throughout the Nation. Certainly we need to perfect it and certainly we need to go forward with it rather than retreat.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had about concluded my remarks. In fact, they would have been concluded a long time ago but for the generous number of questions which have been addressed to me by my distinguished colleagues.

I was speaking on the point of the manifest interrelationship between the soil-conservation program and the price-support program. I had commented that section 348 has made a specific tie-in between those two programs since



the date of the enactment of the first Soil Conservation Act.

I had remarked, also, that certain sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act had made specific reference to soil conservation, and vice versa; that certain sections of the Soil Conservation Act had made specific reference to price support.

I believe I have inserted in the RECORD a portion of section 7, namely, subsection 5 of section 7 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

I now wish to place in the RECORD a portion of section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended and reenacted last year as the Agricultural Act of 1954. It is my understanding that this provision, which is the basis for a price-support program, has been unchanged since the act of 1948 which bears the name of our distinguished friend from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. This provision has been unchanged since the act of 1949 which bears the name of our distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It was left undisturbed by the act of 1954.

For the purpose of brevity, Mr. President, I shall not read all the provisions of section 401, but I wish to read enough to make it clear that it refers to price support, and I shall quote two of the fundamental objectives of price support as contained in the statute itself.

Mr. President, there are 8 different factors listed, but I shall read only the first and the eighth of them, together with the beginning of the statement to which items 1 to 8 are appended:

The following factors shall be taken into consideration in determining, in the case of any commodity for which price support is discretionary, whether a price-support operation shall be undertaken and the level of such support and, in the case of any commodity for which price support is mandatory, the level of support in excess of the minimum level prescribed for such commodity:

Then are listed the factors Nos. 1 to 8 which the Secretary of Agriculture must consider in the cases of both mandatory supports and discretionary supports. They include, of course, under mandatory supports, both the basic commodities and the mandatory nonbasic commodities. The first item listed is:

(1) The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor,

This means, of course, that the supply, the production, and the amount to be produced comprise the first factor for consideration.

The eighth factor—and it bears so completely upon the situation which has been discussed at too great length this afternoon that I wish to emphasize it—is as follows:

(8) The ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

It is very clear that the program of price supports involves soil conservation and land use, and that the program of soil conservation involves economic questions of price, return, purchasing power, and the like, so that even without the inclusion of section 348 throughout all the years as being applicable to make specific the relationship between the

price-support operation and the soil-conservation proposition, and even without the enlargement of section 348 last year, so that it now covers all of the basic commodities, it would have been certain that there is a clear relationship between the two operations.

I have already, likewise, quoted from the appropriation bill of last year and from the appropriation bill of this year as passed by the House and the Senate, and which is now in conference. In the particular item which has been quoted, there is no difference between the two Houses. We are now seeking to make it completely clear that the Secretary of Agriculture in his administration of the soil-conservation program must give great consideration to the acreage displaced by the price-support program, and that that is one of the primary objectives to which he shall give his concern.

In closing, I may say that it seems to me that the issue is very simple. It is whether or not we meant what we said last year when we decided to have a price-support program which was realistic, which would give to the growers the responsibility of keeping their supplies in line with demand, which would place upon our administrative officer the responsibility of seeing to it that supplies were kept in line with demand; and of making certain, so far as Congress is concerned, that nothing was done to weaken or destroy the effectiveness of that program, until it had a chance to demonstrate its efficiency or its lack of efficiency.

What we are asked to do is to strike down a very important provision of that program. To do so, in my humble judgment, will have a disastrous effect in that it will show rather affirmatively to all the people of the Nation that we are perfectly willing to have acreage allotments violated. I will not say that we will invite the violation of acreage allotments, because I would not impute that kind of objective to any fellow Senator. But I will say that the passage of the bill would open the door wide, and would leave it wide open, so that any farmer who cared to violate the law could do so, and he would not be subjected to any question at all as to his right to claim and to receive from our generous Government soil-conservation payments, notwithstanding the fact that his own conduct, in relation to the control of his own acreage and the control of his production, violated the purpose of the law and tended to thwart the purpose of the Government and the people in bringing about more stable and more satisfying conditions in agriculture, and at the same time, of course, a more satisfying situation to all the people of the Nation.

I do not believe the membership of the Senate wishes to be left in the position of having deliberately weakened the act, of having deliberately left open the door to violations of acreage allotments before, indeed, there has been any opportunity to demonstrate either of two things: The usefulness of the act as a whole, and the effect of section 348 upon any of the very useful agricultural programs of the Nation.

Section 348 along with other portions of the act has just gone into operation, and no person can state with accuracy what will be the result of a full year's trial or a full year's administration of the program as to its value or its lack of value to the people, and particularly its value or lack of value to the agricultural producers.

I hope the proposed substitute, which meets all the practical situations that are known to exist, and which leaves a club in the act, particularly over large mechanized producers, who have been the gravest violators, and will continue to be so, of their acreage allotments, will be agreed to, thus providing an opportunity to require compliance by other than soft words.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will withhold it for a moment, gladly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think some reply should be made to the discussion which has been in progress this afternoon, prior to having a quorum call. Will the Senator be kind enough to withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had intended to have a quorum call, because some of my associates are not on the floor; and I wish to give them an opportunity to be present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator wishes to have a quorum call, he will have to lose his right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already surrendered the floor and have suggested the absence of a quorum, which is, of course, within my rights.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, in order that Members of the Senate may know of our plans with regard to this evening and Tuesday next. I call the proposal to the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

I submit, on behalf of both the minority leader and myself, the following proposed unanimous-consent agreement:

*Ordered*, That, effective on Tuesday, May 17, 1955, after the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of H. R. 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, the discussion on H. R. 1573 has digressed into many channels and many areas of interest. We have heard speeches raising the question whether or not partisanship was involved in the consideration of agricultural matters.

May I say that I stand here as the living testimony to the fact that there could be no partisanship? Here is an administration proposal which the junior Senator from Minnesota is trying to get through the Senate, and here is an administration proposal which the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is opposing. If there is any partisanship in that situation, it is something like Alice in Wonderland—it is upside down.

I seldom find myself in the rather unusual position of being an advocate of a recommendation from the Department of Agriculture, but I want it made crystal clear that that is exactly what is happening here tonight, namely, that the Department of Agriculture has called for the repeal of section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. President, it will be interesting to note that the bill before the Senate was presented also to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by a number of our colleagues. Those colleagues were the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

It is also important to note that no objection was registered to this bill in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I say that after having carefully checked the record, which shows that no objection was registered by vote or by formal notice in the committee.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I yield.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** How many members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were present?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I do not recall. I only know there were no votes in the negative. I know the subcommittee was unanimous. If I recall correctly, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was there at the time. I also recall that there was a quorum present at the meeting of the committee.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I yield.

**Mr. AIKEN.** I should like to say that the Senator from Vermont was late in getting to the committee that day. As I recall, most of the work of the committee had been done. Of course, if I

had not been engaged in other official business, I might have been present at the committee meeting. But I wish to make clear that frequently I do not register an objection to the reporting of a bill with which I disagree for I believe that the Senate as a whole should be allowed to debate bills and to register its position on them.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I respect the judgment of the Senator from Vermont on these matters.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Although the record will show I was present in the committee on that day, I believe there were approximately three bills left to report when I arrived there.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I thank the Senator from Vermont for stating his position. I do not consider the fact that a committee member voted either one way or another on the question of reporting a bill to be of great importance in connection with consideration of the bill by the Senate.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

**The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair).** Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I yield.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] had asked to be present in the committee when the bill was considered. He was detained in the Committee on Public Works, but was on his way to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If he had reached the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in time, there certainly would have been at least one vote in opposition to having the committee report the bill, and there certainly would have been some debate in the committee in opposition to having the committee report the bill.

But the Senator from Florida did not reach the committee in time. That situation was not the fault of any Senator. Such situations develop simply because all of us are too busy. Certainly no one was trying to harm anyone else. The Senator from Florida attempted to be present, but he was unable to be.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I appreciate that.

**Mr. HOLLAND.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

**The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair).** Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I yield.

**Mr. HOLLAND.** Mr. President, what the Senator from New Mexico has said is correct. A large delegation from Florida had come to see me regarding a matter then before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I had made a telephone call to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and had asked that action on this bill be postponed until I was able to reach the committee. The chairman advised me that although the committee's meeting had barely begun, the bill had already been voted to be reported; and later he

told me that objection was made to a request for reconsideration of that action by the committee.

So my dissent was quite clearly voiced in the only way I could then voice it—namely, over the telephone, for I did not have an opportunity to be present.

Therefore, Mr. President, under the circumstances I believe the Senator from Minnesota would not say that I agreed to the reporting of the bill by the committee.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I do not yield at the moment.

Mr. President, I was only stating the facts. It is a fact that in the committee there was no vote in opposition to reporting the bill. It is also a fact that a quorum of the committee was present.

Mr. President, I shall not yield for the moment for a discussion of these technicalities, because the RECORD has been made perfectly clear by the Senator from Florida and by the Senator from Minnesota.

An effort has been made to show that the Department of Agriculture is uncertain as to its stand on the bill. I wish to have the RECORD made perfectly clear, in showing that the Department of Agriculture is not uncertain with regard to its position on the bill. The Department of Agriculture may be overly polite to the supporters of the Benson farm program; but when the chips were down and when the Department had to face its responsibility, it made its position clear.

I am sure it must be difficult for the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture and his many advisers who have been referred to today, to have to disagree with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who, a year ago, did such yeoman service for them. I am sure it must be difficult for the Secretary of Agriculture to have to tell the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] he is wrong. I am sure it must be difficult for the Secretary of Agriculture to have to tell my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], that the Department cannot agree with his position.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has been praised very much by my three distinguished colleagues. But is it not interesting for us to note that when the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates have been asked whether they could go along with the Holland amendment—and I can imagine that there was a pleading voice or at least compelling argument on that score—the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department have said, "No."

Let there be no doubt about the matter insofar as the RECORD is concerned. I am unwilling to have the RECORD indicate that there has been any vacillation on the part of the Department on this issue; and I shall not permit the RECORD to indicate that, somehow or other, the Secretary of Agriculture got in line and was committed and that, even though now, on second thought, he might think differently, yet, since he was committed, he is "staying with it."



Mr. President, I cannot believe that a man of principle, such as Ezra Taft Benson, would permit anything of that sort to be done in the name of political expediency. I am sure that if a man of such principle thought the facts compelled him to change his mind, he would speak out and would say so.

What is the statement we have received from the Department of Agriculture? It is as follows:

Statement reaffirming position with respect to a proposal to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. President, I shall read the statement, as set forth in the memorandum coming from the Department of Agriculture. I have this statement from the Department of Agriculture, from the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary:

After careful additional review and analysis by the Department of the proposal to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, we wish to reaffirm our position that this section be repealed. While the amendments proposed by Senator HOLLAND with respect to certain technical objections which we had to this section are generally met, nevertheless we feel that there should be no relationship between eligibility for ACP payments and participation in an allotment and marketing-quota program. In view of the fact that marketing quotas are in effect for all the basic commodities except corn, the eligibility requirement of section 348 will, even after amendment—

Even after the Holland amendments—affect principally those farmers with corn allotments. Also there will necessarily be a tremendous amount of administrative detail. In view of the principle involved and the discriminatory nature of the present legislation, we recommend repeal of section 348.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I decline to yield for the moment.

Mr. President, my friends, who are so able, and who have explained here, for hour after hour, their amendment—my friends and colleagues, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who have participated in this debate—can explain, and explain, and explain, and they can lead us off into one side road after another; but when the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department were faced with the necessity of making a decision, even after the argument and the persuasive eloquence and the perseverance of the Senator from Florida, the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department said:

We recommend repeal of section 348.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Who signs that communication, I should like to ask.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is a communication from Mr. McConnell.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did he sign it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; but he sent it to me, after a telephone conversation.

Does the Senator from Florida doubt that it was sent to me?

I read:

Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, as per our telephone conversation of this morning.

And it is dated "5/9/55."

I doubly checked with Mr. McConnell because of private conversations between myself and the Senator from Florida. I had my administrative assistant check with Mr. McConnell.

While the Department of Agriculture said the amendment of the Senator from Florida might solve some of the difficulties, yet the Department recommended repeal.

I know the Senator from Florida has made a pretty good argument with a fairly bad amendment, and I wish to compliment him on doing what I consider a first-class job on a second-class proposition—and that is no small assignment.

The Senator from Florida has retained in his amendment the language of section 348. He fathered this language. It means something. I now read from the amendment:

Any person who knowingly harvests an acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

That was the original intent, namely, that no payments whatsoever for soil conservation should be made under this title if there had been any variation or any violation of the allotments. Then, after having set forth that noble principle, we find line after line—14 lines—of the amendment to prove to the people and to the country and to the Senate that we really did not mean it. In other words, it is proposed that we follow the moral principle of providing a penalty, and that we provide for rigid control, but that then we say, "But in order to please the wheat growers, we will provide for a little exception, a little later on; and in order to please the peanut growers, we will provide for another little exception, a little later on; and in order to please those who produce corn, if they produce it only for ensilage, we will provide for a little exception for them, too."

In short, Mr. President, the amendment amounts to a botched-up job. I commend the Department of Agriculture for adhering to principle and for refusing to agree to an amendment which does not do the job, and I shall prove that the amendment does not do the job.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I am very happy to have the Senator from Minnesota make the record clear, for I understand that earlier today the impression was given—given again, let me say—that the wheat farmer is the villain. However, now we find, from the Department's own statement, that this provision affects

primarily the corn farmers, who are located principally in the Eastern States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed so.

Mr. YOUNG. In Minnesota and North Dakota, and other States in our area, there is very little noncompliance. The farmers are very careful to comply with all the regulations under the price-support programs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. Will the Senator tarry a moment and listen to what the National Grange has to say? The Grange favors the repeal of section 348. There was an indication today that only the Farmers Union—even though I consider it to be one of the truly great agricultural organizations of the Nation—came forward and testified in opposition.

Mr. President, the National Grange, through its legal consultant, Joseph O. Parker, speaking in behalf of the National Grange, in its convention assembled, made the following statement:

The Grange favors the repeal of section 348.

The executive committee of the National Grange, on January 24, 1955, adopted a resolution authorizing the national office to seek repeal of this provision. It was their view that payment for conservation practices should not be used as an enforcement measure to obtain compliance with other programs unrelated to conservation matters.

There is no longer any direct relationship between the agricultural conservation program and the acreage allotment and marketing quota program. Conservation payments are so small that, in the main, they would have little effect from the standpoint of enforcing compliance with acreage allotments, but their denial might prove costly in the way of "lost" conservation.

I invite the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to this:

In addition, the farmers who are most likely to be affected if section 348 remains in the law are the small farmers who need every encouragement to continue carrying out needed conservation practices.

In other words, the way the law is now written, the small farmer is damaged; and if we repeal section 348, it will be helpful to the family-sized farm.

The National Grange is no special interest group. This organization has a reputation second to none for integrity, for honorable purpose, and for objective analysis of many legislative proposals which affect American agriculture.

I wish also to invite the attention of my colleagues, as they read this RECORD over the weekend and prepare to return to vote on this issue on Tuesday, to the fact that the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ervin L. Peterson, said:

This section does not appear to be effective in influencing farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

In other words, section 348 is a dud, a mistake. It has only caused trouble for the Department and for the farmers.

It seems to me that instead of having pride of authorship, instead of being persistent in demanding that this section be maintained, even if its very purpose were practically distorted by amendment, the thing to do would be to take it out of the law, because it is administratively ineffective, because it perpetrates an in-

justice and an inequity upon the farmers themselves. It is doing a terrible thing to soil conservation. Today thousands of farmers in America are being denied soil conservation payment benefits simply because of this provision in the present agricultural law. Those farmers are not, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said, "on a free ride to prosperity." Those farmers pay 50 percent of the cost of soil conservation practices. They get a 50-percent helping hand from the Federal Government. This program is a part of the diverted acres program. It is a part of the national conservation policy. Our Government, from the Secretary of Agriculture down through the Soil Conservation Service, is deeply concerned over the impediment which has been placed in the way of sound soil conservation practices by a very unfortunate amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act which was adopted in 1954—an unfortunate amendment to an unfortunate and unpardonable piece of legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator know who wants this amendment, besides certain Members of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certain groups of the American Farm Bureau Federation sent representatives to testify in behalf of it, but Mr. Lynn, when he came here to testify, said that the Iowa Farm Bureau was opposed to it. How many more farm bureaus are opposed I do not know, but I do know that the only registered opposition before the subcommittee was from the Farm Bureau, and even that was not too positive, because, as I have mentioned, in the testimony one of the largest sections of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Iowa Farm Bureau, was said to be for the repeal of section 348.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator agree that if this question were left to a vote of the farmers themselves, there would probably be no more than 2 percent of the farmers who would approve of the amendment, and that they would probably be the silk-stocking class?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct, and I think he is being generous in his percentage.

What was the purpose of the soil conservation program? Was it to punish farmers? Was it a disciplinary measure? Not at all. The fact that soil conservation payments were tied in with cotton has no direct relationship to soil conservation payments being tied in with other crops. First of all, there are no production quotas with respect to corn. There are acreage allotments. With respect to cotton, there are both production quotas and acreage allotments. Therefore the control over it is much more rigid. In years gone by there have been farmers who have not agreed to acreage allotments. But we did not try to tamper with the program of soil conservation or to use it as a punitive measure with respect to those who were unwilling to go along with allotments.

What is the penalty for a farmer who does not abide by acreage allotments or production quotas? I will tell the Sen-

ate what the penalty is. It is much more severe than the loss of \$50 of soil conservation payments. The penalty is no crop loans on his crop, no price supports on his crop. That is an effective penalty. Soil conservation is supposed to have the constructive purpose of building up the soil, and of teaching farmers soil conservation practices, in order to help them to make the soil more productive, to use diverted acres, and to hold those diverted acres in grasslands, and to engage in other soil conservation practices.

I think it is most important to note that all the testimony which came to us underscores everything that those of us who are supporting this amendment have had to say.

I listened with keen interest to the attempts which were made to try to make us believe that the Department of Agriculture did not mean what it said. Let me refer again to what the Department of Agriculture had to say:

Also, the present average ACP amount of cost sharing of less than \$100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

The principle effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms.

That was not only from Mr. True Morse, Under Secretary, but it was from the Farmers Union, and from the National Grange.

It is very strange to find our friends, who are supposedly supporting the Farm Bureau position, speaking in direct contradiction of the Farm Bureau position. The Farm Bureau says that we ought to separate soil conservation completely from the allotment and production quota systems. The Farm Bureau recommends that we place the entire soil conservation program back in the hands of the States, in the Extension Service.

We find those who are basing their action in part upon the testimony of the American Farm Bureau Federation indicating that there ought to be a direct relationship in terms of production controls and soil conservation, with penalties.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that he is astonished that the Farm Bureau Federation does not own the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. I was astonished that my colleagues, able and distinguished as they are, tried to base a part of their case upon the position of that organization. The only witness to come before the subcommittee in opposition to the repeal of section 348 was the witness of the Farm Bureau Federation, and it was lukewarm in its opposition. Even then it was not unanimous opposition, because the Iowa Farm Bureau was in favor of repealing section 348. What I am saying is that the only outside evidence and support that we can point to from great farm organizations is from the Farm Bureau Federation, and their position is that soil-conservation practices and programs should go back to the States, and much of it put in the hands of the Extension Service.

All I am trying to do is to keep the record straight. I listened this afternoon with considerable interest to the comments about the advisers to the Secretary of Agriculture. Those are the same advisers my distinguished colleagues held in such esteem a short time ago. Those same advisers have been advising the Secretary all along the line. They must be right once in a while. They have apparently come to realize the unfortunate effects of the provisions of section 348. Those advisers, from the head of the soil-conservation program up to the Under Secretary of Agriculture, have stated that this section should be repealed.

I have just 1 or 2 other comments to make on this subject, and I shall yield the floor on this particular item.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I regret he is not on the floor. I had hoped earlier today that I might have a chance to speak with him about his statement. The Senator from Kansas was one of those who proposed a bill to repeal section 348. It is S. 494. What did that bill propose? It proposed to repeal section 348.

The Senator from Kansas listened to the persuasive argument—and it was a persuasive argument—of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]; that is, it was persuasive so far as the argument went. The Senator from Kansas came at least close to saying that possibly the amendment of the Senator from Florida met his objections to section 348. I wish the Senator from Kansas were here. However, I shall rely upon the written record. I want to read from the statement the Senator from Kansas made to the chairman of our committee. He said:

Mr. Chairman, my bill (S. 494) was introduced for the purpose of repealing section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I feel that it was never intended or contemplated even remotely that the agricultural conservation program should be tied in with the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota law.

The Senator from Kansas says it was never intended or contemplated, even remotely, that the agricultural conservation program should be tied in with the acreage-allotment and marketing-quota law.

I should like to say to my friend from Kansas that the Holland amendment does tie it in. The Holland amendment is predicated upon the proposition that there is a tie-in and a tie-up between soil conservation payments and acreage allotments and production quotas.

I only hope that our good friend from Kansas in reviewing the RECORD will see that the bill he offered is in conflict with the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and his associates.

I continue with the statement of the Senator from Kansas:

The effect of this amendment, which is now section 348, was to deprive a farmer of his ACP payments if he knowingly exceeded his acreage allotment on any one of the crops then under control. I do not believe there was any element of control contemplated in the original ACP program.



The provision I am attempting to repeal here will particularly affect corn and wheat producers. It will not have any material effect on cotton and peanut and tobacco producers because those commodities are under marketing quotas whenever acreage allotments are in effect, and that almost automatically prevents any farmer from being out of compliance.

Is it not interesting to note that cotton and tobacco and peanut producers for all practical purposes are not affected by section 348? However, the producers of corn and wheat, who have taken severe acreage cuts and have had millions of acres taken out of production, and have suffered a drop in price, should be denied soil-conservation payments.

The situation with respect to cotton and corn is entirely different even under the law, so far as controls and regulations are concerned.

The legislation we are talking about repealing, that is, section 348, is designed in part to help out the farmers who produce wheat and corn in areas that are now arid, drought-stricken, wind-blown, and who are the victims of pestilence. It would give them a little soil-conservation benefits.

If my colleagues wish to apply more severe penalties for violation of acreage allotments, let them write those penalties into law. However, let us not use such a constructive, progressive, and forward-looking program as the soil-conservation program as a club to discipline those who in some manner or another exceed their allotments. We should have soil conservation even if we never have any acreage allotment. We would need soil conservation even if we never heard the words "production quota."

I am happy to note that the Department of Agriculture, on second thought, feels that section 348 is not advisable, that section 348 works in contradiction to the purposes and needs of the farm program, and that section 348 should be repealed.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who presides over the Senate at this time, also presented a bill before our committee. I may say that it was a bill that had exactly the same purpose as H. R. 1573. His bill is known as S. 517. It is noted and referred to in the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Report No. 210.

I have before me the statement of the Senator from South Dakota. It is important that I read 1 or 2 sections of his statement:

This provision of the law—

Speaking of section 348—

was severely criticized by the groups as they do not wish to have this provision applied to wheat or corn. We have had a number of letters requesting that some action be taken to have the above section repealed.

In 1954 in South Dakota it now appears that the compliance in the corn allotment program will only be about 40 percent; in other words, 60 percent of the farmers in the commercial corn area will have overplanted their allotment.

In other words, 60 percent of the farmers do not get the benefit of crop loans, or the price-support program, which is

based on crop loans. They have to go into the free market. They must take lower prices. That is enough penalty for one who does not want to abide by the production-control program of the Government.

The Senator from South Dakota continues:

They have lost their price-support protection, but under the present provision governing the 1954 program they will still be eligible to receive Federal cost-sharing payments under the agricultural conservation program. In 1955, if similar conditions prevail, they will not be eligible for ACP payments. It is the general feeling of the farmers that price support should not be tied in with the AC program. Under the price-support program, the producer is being guaranteed greater returns for his product and he receives a direct monetary benefit; but in the case of the Federal cost sharing in the AC program the producer must contribute out of his own pocket not less than 50 percent of the cost of carrying out the practice. The benefits accruing from the conservation practices may not be of a monetary benefit to him immediately; in fact, it may take several years before he realizes any financial benefit from the practices carried out, but the consumers of the United States are assured that the benefits of the soil- and water-conservation program will insure to them a plentiful supply of food and fiber from the farms and ranches of America.

For this reason, therefore, I introduced S. 517, a bill to repeal section 311 (a) of the Agricultural Act of 1954, Public Law 690, 83d Congress.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this information to the members of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and will appreciate any considerations given to S. 517.

Mr. President, I think that is a pretty persuasive argument. The Senator from South Dakota has placed his finger on the truth in this particular case. A soil-conservation program has long-range benefits, regardless of any kind of price-support program. A soil-conservation program stands on its own merits, regardless of any acreage allotments and marketing-quota provisions tied into a price-support program. I repudiate the effort which is being made to try to treat these two separate and distinct programs as if they were siamese twins. They are, in fact, separate programs. We might have a soil-conservation program without any price-support program whatsoever. We do have soil-conservation programs for land on which there are no crops which are price supported.

It is interesting to note that the soil-conservation payments which are being used as the penalty are being so used only for those crops which are basic commodities. There are other crops that are planted. There are barley, oats, rye, substitute crops for corn and wheat. Yet section 348 was directed essentially at the so-called basic commodities.

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to be clear that nonbasic commodities are also price supported. Yet, if my memory serves me correctly, section 348 applies to the basic commodities.

Mr. President, I hope that when we finally come to vote on this bill on Tuesday we shall keep one thing in mind, not whether we are for high price supports or flexible supports, not whether Secretary Benson is the world's greatest Secretary of Agriculture or is a person of

lesser capacity, not whether or not those of us who voted in 1954 were right or wrong, but to concentrate our attention on this particular proposal, namely, the repeal of section 348.

Why do I ask this? Because right now farmers need to know what the policy of the Government is going to be. They need to have a sense of direction from the Department of Agriculture as to what the soil-conservation policies are to be. I can say, in all candor, that they are not going to get much sense of direction from the Holland amendment because it opens up a Pandora's box for administrative abuse, for administrative discretion, and for administrative detail. I listened to the Senator from Florida say that if a farmer violates an acreage allotment it can be measured and ascertained whether there was too much planted or produced. Mr. President, the Department does not have enough people to do that kind of thing. That is why the Department has said in their statement to me that there will necessarily be a tremendous amount of administrative detail, that they will be spending a good deal of time, money, and effort on administrative management of an amendment that is administratively impossible and unwieldy.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment when it is called up. I recognize that there may be a feeling that the whole subject matter needs to be further discussed. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] offered what I thought was a fair and reasonable alternative. He said:

Let us proceed with the repeal of section 348 and then let the Holland amendment go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where representatives of the Department and representatives of organizations which are interested can testify, and we can determine whether there is merit to any of the provisions of the amendment and whether the act of 1954 should be further amended.

I hope that that procedure may be followed, but it appears that it will not.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN AT THE STEPHEN WISE AWARD DINNER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that last night one of the most beloved Members of the Senate, the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, received the annual Stephen Wise award at a dinner of the American Jewish Congress at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C.

In accepting the award Senator LEHMAN made a brilliant speech, one which I think will glow in history as a shining example of the statesmanship of the Senator from New York. At this time I should like to read into the RECORD several paragraphs of his speech, in the course of which he discussed civil rights and civil liberties.

On the subject of civil rights, Senator LEHMAN had the following to say, in part:

I do not know whether I will live to see the day when equal rights are assured—and

enjoyed—by every citizen, without discrimination or segregation, direct or implicit. Nor do I know whether enough years will be granted me to observe that day when civil liberties are again enshrined in their proper place in America, and exercised freely, without fear or reproach.

But I pledge you tonight that in what years are left me I will continue to strive toward those goals and to make available what energies and talents I have to the common effort to realize them.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the sentiments expressed in that beautiful statement by Senator LEHMAN only mirror the record the Senator from New York already has made in the field of civil rights. I am sure I express the hopes and prayers of all Members of the Senate when I say we trust he will enjoy a great many more years in the Senate of the United States, to continue the great fight he has made for civil rights and civil liberties.

A little later in his speech—and I now refer to page 4—we find the following statement, on which I wish to comment:

Yet, as Walter Lippmann has brought out so brilliantly in his recent book, "The Public Philosophy," free debate is the heart and soul of democracy. It is the justification of democracy. Without it, democracy does not and cannot function. Unless the representatives of the people can freely debate, and the people freely hear all the arguments, pro and con, on all public questions, democracy becomes merely a form and a phrase. Representative government, without free debate, can become as oppressive as totalitarian government or as destructive and chaotic as anarchy itself. In either case, the end and the result are the same.

Mr. President, I have read that part of Senator LEHMAN's speech because, in making that statement, he has set forth one of the basic tenets of my own political philosophy, a tenet which Senator LEHMAN has exemplified and personified time and time again here in the Senate. In that connection, I have seen him stand almost alone in the Senate, Mr. President; and only in recent weeks he has demonstrated once again his dedication to the principle set forth in the part of his speech I have just read, his devotion to the principle that free debate is important to the maintenance of our freedom, and his belief that all Members of the Senate, even when they are in a small minority, must be sufficiently courageous to fight for the maintenance of free debate and the opportunity to express views which differ from those of the majority on any issue, and must be perfectly willing to let history judge of the correctness of their course of action.

Mr. President, I have been so favorably impressed with Senator LEHMAN's speech, and I have been so greatly moved by its symbolism in relation to the meaning of democracy, that I ask unanimous consent to have the entire speech printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT STEPHEN WISE AWARD DINNER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I would be insensitive, indeed, if I were not moved by this gathering tonight of so

many good friends assembled here to do me honor.

When I was advised that I was to be given the Stephen S. Wise award, I expressed to the American Jewish Congress my heartfelt thanks and appreciation. I renew that expression here tonight upon the actual receipt of that fine and inspiring award. And I am happy to present the \$1,000 check I have just received to the United Jewish Appeal, to further the humanitarian work which that fine organization has carried on for so many years.

The award given me is for service in the cause of civil rights and civil liberties. I said a year ago—it is still true tonight—I consider the award as much a mandate for the future as a recognition of the past. I judge the goals in question to be so far from achieved, and yet so vital to our national salvation, that none of us dares rest on past contributions. This cause continues to challenge the devotion of every American.

I do not know whether I will live to see the day when equal rights are assured—and enjoyed—by every citizen, without discrimination or segregation, direct or implicit. Nor do I know whether enough years will be granted me to observe that day when civil liberties are again enshrined in their proper place in America, and exercised freely, without fear or reproach.

But I pledge you, tonight, that in what years are left me, I will continue to strive toward those goals, and to make available what energies and talents I have to the common effort to realize them.

On the civil rights front, we have made some progress over the past 30 years—remarkable progress. There is a general recognition today of the undeniable right of all Americans to enjoy equal treatment, under law, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. But there is a vast and intolerable gap between the recognition of that right and the realization of it. The theory is accepted, but the practice is still denied.

It is true that the forces of bigotry and prejudice are falling back. Notable victories have been won against discrimination and segregation. But the distance we have yet to go is much greater than that we have already come, and the battles yet to fight, much more arduous than those already gained.

There are still great areas of our country where discrimination and segregation are written into law. And there still are extensive sectors of our national life—perhaps the greater parts of it—where discrimination and segregation are not the written but the unwritten law, rigidly enforced by custom and practice.

Our task is to tear down these walls of discrimination and segregation, both visible and invisible, and thus to insure true equality of rights and opportunity for all our citizens.

The forces opposed to us are strong. In regard to the obvious forms of discrimination and segregation—those provided or sanctioned by law—we face an entrenched and determined resistance. Those who support and defend these restrictions on the rights of minorities occupy strategic positions of authority. In the Congress, they have been able—and probably still are—to block remedial legislation by means of the filibuster. We have yet to secure the weapon—an effective cloture rule—needed to break this blockade of majority rule.

I would be less than honest if I did not also say that the forces in Congress supporting civil rights are less zealous and resolute today than they have been in the past. This is as true among members of my own party from north of the Mason and Dixon Line, as among members of the Republican Party.

Even among some of unquestioned and unquestionable good will, there is a strong tendency to put the civil rights issue aside for another day. Others are resigned to making only token progress, believing that it is better

to settle for an inch than to struggle, perhaps vainly, for a mile.

I do not pretend to be all-wise in this or in any other field. But I do not judge this strategy to be either morally right or practically sound. I believe, with all my heart, that in the struggle for basic human values—for equal civil rights for all Americans—the banner must be kept high and the struggle relentlessly pressed. The goal of human equality must never be compromised.

I firmly believe that in this cause, every battle is a victory. The more strenuous the battle, the greater the victory, regardless of how, apparently, the battle goes. For we are pressing forward with a tide that is as irresistible as time itself. The surge for human equality is worldwide and cannot be denied. Let us exert ourselves in that direction, without stint or restraint. We will be restrained enough by those who oppose us.

A very wise man, Harry S. Truman, said recently, speaking on the subject of civil rights, that we should beware of those who urge us not to paddle, lest we rock the boat. I agree with Harry Truman. As every sailor knows, there is nothing more dangerous than drifting.

I recognize that those who counsel patience and plead practical difficulties have a certain logic on their side. Certainly the advance toward full equality should be orderly. But there is an obligation resting upon some of us boldly to spearhead the attack, courageously to join the issue, and resolutely to force the debate. The passion of conviction must animate us. We must fight for what is right.

So much for civil rights. Now, as to civil liberties.

While some progress has been made in the one, we have had little but retreat in the other. In recent months we have indeed scored some few victories for civil liberties, but these have come after such a succession of defeats, that we have far, far to go before we can even say that we are back at the point from which we started.

But let us count our blessings. Senator MCCARTHY has been temporarily forced into eclipse. I am not sure that he is permanently in the shadows, but he is, for the moment, at least, a power not much to be reckoned with.

The fog of fear has lifted, up to a point. The Nation's headlines are no longer preoccupied with smears and reckless charges. Congress serves less as a privileged sanctuary for the launching of hit-and-run raids against the loyalty and reputation of individuals, institutions, and organizations. The mania for congressional investigations of individuals, and for exposing them to trial by ordeal, has somewhat abated.

There has been a change—decidedly for the better. We may all rejoice over this.

But let us not rejoice too long, nor relax at all. We have work to do, a monumental work, just to patch up the ruins, not to speak of recovering lost ground and of preparing for another onslaught, if it should come—and it may come.

Should the bird of peace we have recently glimpsed turn into a bird of prey, and of war, the demagogues would surely ride again throughout our land.

And make no mistake about it, the safeguards of our liberties have been greatly weakened. The area of true liberty—of the right to practice the freedoms guaranteed us by the Constitution—have greatly shrunk.

The right of free debate has been effectively curtailed. There are some subjects—too many subjects—which it is impossible to discuss on their merits, without running the dread danger of being called "soft" on communism.

The recognition of Communist China, and the admission of Communist China into the United Nations, is one such question.



The Internal Security Act is another such question. The Smith Act is a third. Our Government security program is a fourth. Wiretapping is another. The fifth amendment and immunity is still another. There are more issues—many more—which lie at the heart of both our foreign policy and our domestic tranquility which carry the severest limitations in regard to free debate and discussion.

Yet, as Walter Lippman has brought out so brilliantly in his recent book, *The Public Philosophy*, free debate is the heart and soul of democracy. It is the justification of democracy. Without it, democracy does not and cannot function. Unless the representatives of the people can freely debate, and the people freely hear all the arguments, pro and con, on all public questions, democracy becomes merely a form and a phrase. Representative government, without free debate, can become as oppressive as totalitarian government or as destructive and chaotic as anarchy itself. In either case, the end and the result are the same.

We need urgently to reestablish the right of free debate and to tear down the curtains of fear which now prevent such debate.

I hope the time will come when it will no longer be necessary for every public speaker to prove his loyalty to America by describing how much he hates communism and the Kremlin.

I hope the time will come when loyalty oaths will pass out of fashion.

I hope the time will come, as Robert Hutchins expressed it, when the touchstone of advocacy or action will cease to be the question: "What will people say?" and will become, instead, "Is it good for the people?" and "Is it well for the people to know?"

The loss of the freedom of public men to speak out, without fear of reprisal or condemnation on the basis of being soft on communism, is not the only loss we have suffered to our liberties, although it is one of the most critical.

There is also the infringement of the right to be wrong.

The right of Government servants—civil servants—to be free in their judgment has been altogether denied. Men like John Paton Davies and John Carter Vincent, in spite of complete loyalty, have been discharged for past advocacy of policies which, in the light of today, may seem wrong. Scientists like Dr. Robert Oppenheimer and Dr. Edward Condon have been stripped of so-called security clearance because of personal associations of long ago, or because of views which have subsequently turned out to be unpopular.

A security program has been instituted for employees of the Government which has spread terror throughout the public service. Its sacrificial victims are countless. Suspension from employment without pay for endless months, and finally dismissal and disgrace, are too often based on unsupported allegations made by anonymous informants.

President Eisenhower has described as a basic principle of American democracy the right of every man to meet his accuser face to face, but his Department of Justice recently argued before the Supreme Court that to grant such a right would endanger our national security.

A case was recently brought to my attention by an official of the American Jewish Congress involving a man for 20 years an employee of the Federal Government, about to be promoted, and then suddenly suspended without pay and charged with being a security risk—all because of anonymous and unsworn allegations made against the brother of this man's wife. The wife's brother was charged with having been a Communist back in 1947. One of the items of evidence cited in support of this allegation was that this

man, back in 1947, had written an article in his local labor union paper, attacking Governor Dewey's Thruway plan.

Whether the allegations against this individual are as incredibly ridiculous as they sound doesn't matter. The fact is that a man was suspended from a Government job—and it was a nonsensical job—after 20 years of faithful service—because of anonymous assertions about his wife's brother.

There are hundreds of such cases—many even more shocking than this one. Some few have become known to the public—the case of Abraham Chasanow, an employee of the Navy Department; the case of Wolf Ladejinsky, of the Department of Agriculture; and the case of Lt. Milo Radulovich, an officer in the United States Air Force Reserve.

But for every case of flagrant injustice which has become publicized there have been hundreds, perhaps even thousands, which have not become known. And they are happening every day, even while we sit here tonight.

And this again is but one further aspect of the ravages to which our liberties have been subjected.

There are more. The Fund for the Republic of the Ford Foundation is studying some of them. I hope that these reports will help to awaken the American people to resolute action and to a crusade—if I may borrow back the word—to restore civil liberties to their honored place in America.

And speaking of crusades, one of my chief and most grievous complaints against this administration and against our President is the utter complacency shown in the face of this situation; and yes, the callous indifference to the inroads which have been made and are being made daily in every part of our land and in so many sectors of our national life. I judge those in positions of authority who have sworn to uphold our liberties and who do not rise to their defense to be guilty of complicity in their infringement.

But in a larger sense this is everybody's problem, as liberty is everybody's business. The opportunity which has been given us to regroup the forces of freedom must be seized. The fight for freedom at home, as well as abroad, is an urgent challenge. None of us dares shirk his share of the responsibility. This concern must be secondary to none.

There are three banners to which all mankind has rallied throughout the ages, and which have stirred men's souls from time immemorial—peace, justice, and freedom. Let these banners be raised here in our country, high above all others, and, with the help and the blessings of God, we will prevail.

#### OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE WOOL ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I desire to refer to a matter which I understand will be discussed later on in the Senate. I understand that my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will discuss this matter in connection with the Wool Act.

I have received today telegrams from Mr. J. P. Steiwer, Secretary of the Oregon Wool Growers Association; from Mr. Bob Franklin, of the National Wool Marketing Association; from Mr. James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; and from Mr. Roy A. Ward, of the Pacific Wool Growers Association.

I wish the RECORD to show that I have received these telegrams, and I now ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOSSIL, OREG., May 12, 1955.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

Wish to urge that you oppose any amendment to Wool Act pending hearing and consultation with wool industry.

J. P. STEIWER,  
Secretary, Oregon Wool Growers.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Just learned yesterday amendment planned today to be added to H. R. 1573 on Senate floor which would amend National Wool Act. Industry has not been consulted, no hearings held. Do not know full import of proposed amendment but understand it is attack on Cooperatives. Respectfully urge you oppose any wool act amendment without full hearing, consultation with woolgrowers and opportunity for Senators and Congressmen from affected producing areas having opportunity to study.

NATIONAL WOOL MARKETING.  
BOB FRANKLIN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12, 1955.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Am reliably informed that amendment to REA bill (S. 153) or to ACP bill (H. R. 1573) will be introduced to kill fourth sentence of section 708 of 1954 Wool Act. Such action would be a crippling blow to integrity of farmers cooperatives and a handicap to effective administration of wool act. Might also cause defeat of bill to which attached as rider.

Respectfully request you to oppose amendment of wool act.

JAMES G. PATTON,  
President, National Farmers Union.

PORTLAND, OREG., May 12, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
United States Senate Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

National Wool Act, section 708, wording Co-ops may vote membership in self-help program vital to success of August referendum vote on self-help program to promote wool-lamb consumption which eventually would reduce need for Government assistance therefor. Appreciate your opposing Anderson amendment, S. 153. Thanks regards.

PACIFIC WOOLGROWERS,  
ROY A. WARD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to say to those who have sent the telegrams that, as a result of my discussion with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I am satisfied there is no basis in fact for the fears of those who sent the telegrams that any amendment which will be discussed by the Senator from New Mexico will in any way jeopardize cooperatives in the United States. Certainly such is not the intention of the Senator from New Mexico. We can take judicial notice, in my judgment—knowing the record of the Senator from New Mexico—that it would not be and could not be his intention to have cooperatives in the United States jeopardized in any way.

I desire to say that I join in the suggestion of the senders of the telegrams

that there be an opportunity for hearings on any amendments which may be offered to the Wool Act; and I shall support the holding of such hearings. Furthermore, I think such hearings will be had, because—knowing the Senator from New Mexico as I do, and knowing his record of complete impartiality and fairness to all parties who wish to present their side of a case—I am sure that those who have sent me the telegrams have no reason to doubt that they will receive absolutely fair play from the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to point out that I know the Senator from Oregon remembers that during the Truman administration, when I was Secretary of Agriculture, there was a desire to send to the Pacific Northwest a speaker who would outline clearly the position of the Truman administration regarding cooperatives. The speaker selected by the then President of the United States was his then Secretary of Agriculture. So I went to Everett, Wash., and made clear my own position and the position of the administration on the subject of cooperatives—to the extent that the cooperatives themselves reprinted more than 200,000 copies of that speech.

I can only assure the Senator from Oregon that the way I felt toward cooperatives then is the way I feel toward cooperatives now; and those who inspired the telegrams to which the Senator from Oregon has referred were, I think, in the first place badly misinformed, because at the time the telegrams were sent, I had not offered any amendment, and I have not now offered an amendment. I may offer one for the RECORD, but I believe that to be within my province.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that he does not have to give me any assurance about his position with respect to farmer cooperatives, because I know of no better friend in the Senate of farmer cooperatives than the junior Senator from New Mexico. I am sure that the Senator fully realizes that, the telegrams having been received, they should be made a part of the RECORD. The Senator and I had a discussion earlier this afternoon. He expressed himself as to the soundness of the position taken in regard to the desire to have hearings. However, in fairness to the Senator from New Mexico, even though the senders of the telegrams are my constituents, I think the RECORD should show that I do not share their fear that the Senator from New Mexico is proposing anything which threatens farmer cooperatives.

Mr. President, I now wish to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor and may proceed.

### THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words by way of explanation of a bill which I shall later introduce.

On April 12 this Nation was thrilled by the announcement that the Salk vaccine had been developed to such a point that it was believed by the researchers who developed it, including the great Dr. Salk himself, by the March of Dimes group, and by prominent medical officials of our own Government, to be a successful preventive of polio. I do not know of any news in a long time which has so thrilled the Nation as this news. I suppose no news has been so thrilling since VE-Day and VJ-Day.

According to the best information I can obtain, the indications still are that this vaccine, when manufactured without impurities in it, and without live cells in it, will prove to be an effective preventive of polio in an overwhelming majority of cases. It offers great hope for reducing, at least, the incidence of the scourge of polio. It gives reasonable assurance of protecting large numbers of little boys and girls who otherwise might contract this dreadful disease. Otherwise, annually large numbers of children would contract it.

At this particular time, when it appears that in some instances certain batches of the vaccine which have been manufactured by some drug companies retain some impurities or live cells which apparently have caused some children to contract polio, possibly as a result of the injection of the vaccine itself, it is to be expected that parents across the Nation experience increasing concern about the wisdom of an inoculation program.

As recently as 2 or 3 hours ago, however, the best information I could obtain was still to the effect that, as soon as checks by the Federal Government health authorities have been completed on the various drug companies which are manufacturing the vaccine, it will be possible to go ahead with the inoculation program, as previously contemplated.

However, Mr. President, I happen to believe that the Federal Government has been guilty of gross negligence in this case, because it appears that all the doublechecks to which American parents were entitled before the vaccine was made available for inoculation purposes were not made by Federal officials.

We are dealing with a situation which has very serious potentialities. It seems to me that, under all the circumstances, the parents of America had the right to look to their Government to make "assurance double sure" that every batch of this vaccine, before it was made available for inoculation into the bloodstreams of American boys and girls, was pure. I do not think the Federal Government had any moral right—and I am speaking now about a matter of governmental morality—to permit any pharmaceutical company to proceed to make this vaccine available on the market without a very careful check by the Government itself as to its purity. Why do we have pure food and drug laws?

It is no answer to say that in this instance the authorities have followed a

formula or pattern which very often is followed in connection with other drugs. We are dealing with a different type of situation. We are dealing with a vaccine which, if it is impure, does not give a person smallpox, dangerous though smallpox may be. We are not dealing with a vaccine which, if it is not pure, may give a person some diseases much less serious than the terrible disease of poliomyelitis. We are dealing with a vaccine which, if it is not pure, may result in the lifetime crippling and deformity of precious values, namely, our American boys and girls.

This vaccine does not involve injections for hay fever or some other relatively less serious disease. It involves one of the most serious scourges of mankind. The Federal officials responsible for letting the vaccine go on the market without testing the batches manufactured by the drug companies are guilty of gross negligence. Mr. President, the Federal Government inspects meat in the slaughterhouses more carefully than it has inspected the polio vaccine offered by the drug companies to the parents of the Nation for inoculating their boys and girls against this dread disease. If the information which is made available to me is true—and I believe it to be—the fact is that the pharmaceutical companies have been permitted to place batches of the vaccine on the market without a check by the Federal health authorities.

Now rechecks on the vaccine are being made which ought to have been made in the first instance. They ought to have been made before one vial of it was made available for injection into a single boy or girl.

I speak on this subject as a parent. I know what it is to go through the horrible, anxious hours following the initial diagnosis of infantile paralysis in a child. Fortunately, in the case of my family, it was a slight attack, and no deformity resulted. Nevertheless, I shall never forget those hours.

Under the circumstances, Senators can well understand why, on April 14, I introduced in the Senate a bill which sought to place the supply of this vaccine completely under the control of the Federal Government for distribution purposes, until such time as there should be an adequate supply of it for all the children of the country and all the adults.

As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, on April 14, when I introduced that bill, 2 days after the thrilling discovery was announced, I proposed that the President of the United States appoint a commission of five, consisting of representatives of the medical profession, pharmaceutical companies, public health groups, State groups, and Dr. Salk, himself. I proposed that the commission have complete charge of the distribution of the vaccine until such time as it could be manufactured in such supply that all the people of the country would have it available to them.

Why did I introduce the bill on April 14? I introduced it on that day because from personal experience I know something about the value of such a vaccine



in eliminating the fears and worries of the parents of America.

The scourge of infantile paralysis is not a private danger. It is not a personal matter. It happens to be a matter of great national concern. I believe that a government representing a free people has the moral duty in a situation such as this to see to it that the vaccine is distributed in a fair manner, which will guarantee the vaccine to the boys and girls, in relation to the priorities of infection possibility, thus making it available first to the boys and girls in the 5 to 10 age bracket, then to the boys and girls in the age bracket under 5, and then in the age bracket above 10. Finally it would be made available to adults, with the understanding, of course, that pregnant women would be in the first priority group, because medical science tells us that women in that category seem to be as susceptible to polio as children in the 5- to 10-year bracket.

The purpose of my bill was to guarantee to the mothers and fathers of this country a distribution of the vaccine equitably and fairly to the boys and girls who are in the greatest danger of polio infection in the epidemic months immediately ahead.

In taking that position, I have the moral law on my side. In taking that position, I am taking a position consonant, in my judgment, with the clear moral duty of my Government. I believe it is to be the clear responsibility of Congress to act in the circumstances.

What were we met with? First, we were met with the statement from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, that the program was to be handled on a voluntary basis. The suggestion was made that here again perhaps the Federal Government was encroaching upon private enterprise. What private enterprise? The vaccine was developed from the dimes of children and parents of America. It was developed from the money the boys and girls and mothers and fathers of America put into the polio fund over the years.

If anything was ever developed and paid for by the people of America, it is the Salk vaccine. The research money for the development of the Salk vaccine came from the great public financial drive known as the March of Dimes. The people of the United States as a people have a vested stake in the Salk vaccine.

I happen to be one who does not believe that there is the slightest tinge of creeping socialism in a bill which proposes that vaccine, which was developed from the dimes taken from the school-children of America and from their parents over the years, shall be distributed by the Federal Government until such time as there is enough vaccine available for the entire population.

Again I am talking about morality. I am talking about moral principles and of doing the right thing in a situation such as this.

We all know the temptations of human frailty. It was no surprise to me that even before the latest crisis inequities and unfairness were developing, and that we were beginning to see the old

spirit of commercialism, profit for profit's sake, creeping into the Salk vaccine program.

In view of the fact that the Salk vaccine program was developed from funds collected in the March of Dimes drive, I happen to believe that it ought to be given free by the Government to every child in America in the number of inoculations necessary to provide the greatest security from a possible attack of polio. That seems to call for free inoculations.

So I go back, Mr. President, to my bill of April 14. I say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that the administration to date has fumbled this matter miserably. The administration, in my judgment, cannot alibi itself out of its position of error in regard to it. In my judgment, at the time it announced the discovery it had a moral duty to take the position that the vaccine would be made available through the Government to the children of America until such time as there was an adequate supply for all. Even then, so far as our precious boys and girls are concerned, inoculations should be paid for by the Government, if payment is to be made by anyone.

When we do that we protect the greatest wealth of America. The greatest wealth of America is the boys and girls of America. The future destiny of our country depends on them.

I am sad to see how the matter has been handled, and I am sadder to see how Mrs. Hobby has been trying to alibi herself out of her own errors. Her alibis are not good enough. They are not good enough for the millions of mothers and fathers of America.

I traveled through the country recently, and I talked to mothers and fathers, and I should like to advise Mrs. Hobby today that they are aware of the fact that she has fumbled the program very badly. In fact, I believe she has even misled the President of the United States, because he is not giving the leadership to this matter that the parents of the country have a right to look to him to give.

I believe the first mistake we made in Congress was that we did not live up to our full obligations. I believe we should have been doing something. We should not have been put off so easily as we were put off by suggestions that there would be a White House conference and another conference in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that we should wait until an advisory committee had made its report, or until some other committee had made a report. Inasmuch as it was clear when the discovery of the vaccine was announced that there would not be enough to go around, it was the moral duty of Congress to enact legislation which would guarantee that the amount available would be distributed equitably and fairly. That was our first problem.

Now we face a second problem. The Government fumbled in the distribution of the vaccine, and it has obviously fumbled in the testing program. I believe we had better find out why the batches of vaccine have not been tested.

Since when does the Federal Pure Food and Drug Agency or the Public Health Agency of the United States Government feel itself justified in turning over to pharmaceutical companies the determination of whether they are putting out pure batches of vaccine designed to combat a disease, the control of which is of such vital importance to the health of the people? We are dealing with a disease for which the vaccine must be pure. If the vaccine is not pure it results in such damage to the human body that the Government has the clear duty to make certain that every possible test is applied before a single vial of it is made available to the public.

Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill on this subject. I am not wedded to every phrase of the bill. I am introducing it for two purposes. I wish to be very frank about it.

First, I hope the bill will afford some incentive to check into the individual cases of boys and girls who have contracted polio since they were inoculated with the vaccine, because, Mr. President, I believe we have the duty to find out if there is a cause-to-effect relationship, as the indications are, and as has been suggested by some medical authorities. As we all know, the medical fraternity is very cautious in the language it uses. It is very careful not to deal in terms of absolute findings until it has checked and rechecked and can be positive that there is a cause-to-effect relationship.

It appears, Mr. President—and I dwell on these words, because I use them advisedly and carefully—that it probably is true that some of the boys and girls would not have suffered an attack of polio had they not been inoculated with impure vaccine under this program.

So I am introducing the bill, which I consider to be very important to the Government, because of its laches, because of what, in my judgment, is gross negligence on the part of our health authorities to look into each one of the individual cases, and if it can be medically established that there is a cause-to-effect relationship, then I think the provisions of my bill should automatically apply.

I am introducing the bill, Mr. President, because I hope it may have some effect on the administration, from the White House down, in connection with the entire program, and that they will proceed directly to take hold of the situation and place the health of the American people first, and place the rights of the boys and girls of the country on a basis of the moral obligation of the Government to make sure that pure vaccine is made available to them, without cost, and that it is fairly distributed.

So I introduce a bill which reads as follows:

That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed, upon application therefor and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to reimburse or otherwise compensate any individual who contracts poliomyelitis subsequent to April 12, 1955, and after receiving one or more injections of poliomyelitis vaccine, for all medical and hospital expenses incurred by such individual as a result of the contraction of that disease. Such expenses shall

include the cost of wheel chairs, trusses, and similar appliances, and therapeutic services and treatment.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

A colleague of mine said in the cloak-room, "That expense may go on for years." Mr. President, suffering will be endured for a long time, too, by those who have been attacked by polio as the result of an injection of impure vaccine. Let me say that, in my judgment, this Government owes a duty to the sufferers because of what I consider to be gross carelessness in the handling of the program.

I intend to have more to say on this subject at a later date, if the administration does not proceed quickly to face and correct the blunders it has made in connection with the administration of the Salk vaccine program up to this time, and to live up to what I consider to be its full moral obligations to the boys and girls of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received, out of order, that it be appropriately referred, and that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

I yield the floor, Mr. President, and I ask that my remarks may appear in the RECORD subsequent to the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair.) The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1976) to authorize the payment by the Government of medical expenses of persons contracting poliomyelitis subsequent to receiving vaccinations for the prevention of that disease, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed, upon application therefor and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to reimburse or otherwise compensate any individual who contracts poliomyelitis subsequent to April 12, 1955, and after receiving one or more injections of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine, for all medical and hospital expenses incurred by such individual as a result of the contraction of that disease. Such expenses shall include the cost of wheel chairs, trusses, and similar appliances, and therapeutic services and treatment.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks. While I can approve of almost everything he said, I especially wish to join him in the words of congratulation, commendation, good wishes, and good will to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I think all Members of the Senate, regardless of on which side of the aisle they may sit, regardless of the fact that our views may be divergent all the way across the rain-

bow from extreme right to extreme left, will want to join in those cordial expressions of appreciation.

#### A FOTENT FORCE FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I sent to the Press Gallery a release on a program which I think has real potentialities for building better human understandings. This is the fifth annual observance of what we call Letters From America Week, May 13 to May 22, sponsored by the American Council for American Unity.

I appeal to all Americans to join in waging the battle for peace in the world.

It is not enough to say we want our Government to work for peace. In a democracy, all of us comprise the Government. If we want peace, all of us must speak out for it, and work for the kind of better human understanding so necessary to achieve it.

Many people who might agree will probably say, "But what can I do? I am just one citizen."

Well, there is something every citizen can do—young and old alike.

It is time for Americans to all help spread the story of democracy to the world, people to people, not just government to government. We have a great story to tell, of our own struggle for freedom and progress. Let us tell the world about it—a "living story" of democracy.

The simplest way each of us can do this is to sit right down and write a letter. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have relatives or other contacts in other parts of the world. Millions of other people in other lands, young people in particular, are hungry for letters from Americans—eager to know more about America. Not only what our Government tells them, but also what our people themselves think about America.

A few dedicated people in this country have made tremendous personal strides in encouraging such letter-writing to help explain our democracy and freedom. It is time all of us joined the crusade.

As I have said, May 16 to May 22 has been designated as "Letters From America Week" by the Common Council for American Unity, one of the dedicated groups devoting its energy to this constructive purpose of encouraging such letter writing.

The fifth annual observance of this week will be aimed at focusing public attention on the important contributions which individuals writing about their life in America to friends, relatives, or business acquaintances abroad can make in the fight against Communist-inspired propaganda.

Not too long ago an Air Force Intelligence survey among Soviet emigres was conducted by Harvard University. One of its findings—which applies in varying degrees on both sides of the Iron Curtain—was that "ignorance and distorted views of the outside world are deeper and more widespread, even among the intelligentsia, than heretofore has been realized."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at

this point a press announcement from the Council for American Unity about the Letters From America Week, May 16 to May 22.

There being no objection, the press announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ADVANCE NOTICE—LETTERS FROM AMERICA WEEK, MAY 16 TO MAY 22, 1955

Letters From America Week, May 16 to May 22, will begin the sixth year of the campaign to utilize in democracy's fight against Communist tyranny the millions of letters Americans send abroad. Some 1,800,000,000 letters have been sent overseas from the United States since the letters from America campaign got underway in 1950. A large part of these are being written by first- and second-generation Americans to their friends and relatives abroad.

The letters from America campaign assists these letter-writers through a series of articles suggesting ways of telling the American story and combating Communist propaganda. Special articles have been contributed to the campaign by such outstanding Americans as Henry Ford II, Paul G. Hoffman, Bernard A. Baruch, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Henry Cabot Lodge. Letters from America articles have, for example, pointed out that President Eisenhower has consistently urged the peaceful uses of atomic energy; that the American economy, the bulwark of freedom, is not headed for a depression; that the United States Supreme Court in a momentous decision has barred racial segregation in the Nation's public schools. Such articles, translated into 23 languages, are widely used by foreign-language newspapers in the United States. Hundreds of foreign language radio programs, nationality organizations, and other American agencies also participate in the letters campaign.

The sponsor is the Common Council for American Unity, a nonprofit organization, supported by voluntary contributions, which has been working with American nationality groups for more than 35 years. It has received widespread testimony both from the United States and abroad as to the effectiveness of the campaign. As one letter writer expressed it:

"I would like to help, as much as I can, to overcome the misconceptions that Europeans have about America and that I myself shared when abroad. I am convinced that if I, and others, write systematically and continuously, it will bring results. People are sometimes skeptical when it comes to big speeches, but by reading simple letters about our everyday life, they feel and know this is the truth. If enough individuals become interested in such correspondence, they could help bring about friendlier world relations."

The council frequently receives copies of letters sent abroad. Here is a paragraph from a letter to a friend in Europe from a man who escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. It speaks for itself:

"Last week I had quite an experience. I saw for the first time a real strike. In fact, I was on strike myself. Can you imagine what I would have gotten for that at home? Ten years in prison. Here I got 10 cents per hour more. At the beginning of the strike I was on pins-and-needles. I remembered everything I was told by Soviet educators about strikes in America; how they were dispersed and workers arrested. Sure enough, several cars with police arrived. Well, I thought to myself, now I am in real trouble. But the policemen got out of their cars, walked among the workers, talked with them, and even made jokes. They came only to keep order, to see that there was no violence. Well, that's freedom."



Last year Letters From America Week was endorsed by most governors, many mayors, the Postmaster General, and many others. The United States Information Agency indicated the importance it attaches to the letters from America campaign by awarding the council a certificate of merit for its "noteworthy contribution in helping to develop world understanding of American concepts and purposes." Even wider endorsement of the letters campaign is anticipated this year.

The dates again are May 16 to May 22.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I urge wholehearted support for this constructive effort. Anyone wanting to know more about it may write to the Common Council for American Unity, Willkie Memorial Building, 20 West 40th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

There is a particular segment of the American population that can be most effective in support of such a campaign, and that is our foreign born. In these days when some, unfortunately, are inclined to look with skepticism at foreign born or those with foreign-sounding names, it would be well for us to realize our foreign born are a unique and significant national asset. Who can better convince people of other lands of America's true aims for peace, of America's abhorrence of war and conquest, than people of other lands who themselves have found freedom here and learned to love democracy?

In the present struggle for a free world, the United States has at its disposal a unique and powerful asset which is not being fully utilized—our 35 million first and second generation Americans, with their many ties of kinship and friendship abroad. No other country has such an asset. Not to make full use of it is to neglect one of our most effective sources of strength.

These 35 million first and second generation Americans maintain close contact with relatives and friends, not only in every country in Europe but in most other parts of the world as well. They believe fervently in American democracy. They want to see their native countries freed from Communist domination or saved from Communist propaganda and infiltration. To these ends they are engaged in a variety of activity. Much that they might do, however, is not being done. Much that is being done could be coordinated more closely with American policy. For the most part they are left alone to go their own ways—unconsulted, unchanneled, unaided.

Mr. President, properly encouraged and assisted, American nationality groups could exert a far greater influence in combatting communism and promoting American objectives. For that reason I welcome the work of the Common Council for American Unity in that direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a report from the Common Council for American Unity about what these American nationality groups are already doing, along with some suggestions of what more could be done.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHAT AMERICAN NATIONALITY GROUPS HAVE DONE

Historically, American nationality groups have frequently played an important role in the liberation and development of their mother countries. Free Czechoslovakia, for example, came into being largely through the efforts of Thomas Masaryk and American nationality groups. The independence of the Irish Free State and the creation of Israel would hardly have been possible without the support of the Irish and Jewish groups in the United States. Sun Yat Sen's fight for a free China was largely financed by the Chinese American community.

The continuing stream of letters from Americans to their families and friends abroad have had a profound effect on world history. They prompted the great waves of immigration which settled the United States. They helped to spread the doctrines of the American Revolution. As recently as 1948, the letters of Italian-Americans had an influential part in Italy's crucial postwar elections.

#### WHAT AMERICAN NATIONALITY GROUPS ARE DOING

Today this same type of contact continues between millions of newer Americans and their homelands. They write the bulk of the 380 million letters sent abroad each year from the United States. They are sending hundreds of thousands of packages of food, clothing, and other necessities to relatives and friends overseas. They send abroad, month after month, a large number of American newspapers and magazines printed in both English and foreign languages. They are frequent visitors in their countries of origin. Many of them have an intimate knowledge of the language, geography, customs, psychology, and thinking of their countries of origin. They are working with exiled leaders and displaced persons in the United States. They maintain an active interest in the fate of their homelands and are contributing large amounts of money for the support of organizations and movements in such countries.

These overseas organizations, leaders, and churches are, in turn, in constant touch with their former countrymen in the United States, now for the most part American citizens, usually with some plea for political, financial, or moral support.

#### THE JOB TO BE DONE

Basically, what is needed is (1) a continuing survey of inventory of the international activities of American nationality groups, and (2) a systematic effort, on the basis of such information, to stimulate and guide such activities.

Activities which would forward American policy should be suggested and nationality groups encouraged to undertake them. Successful activities by one group should be suggested to others. Groups should be urged to intensify existing activity. Efforts not in line with American goals should be discouraged. All this would require not only a climate of confidence and good will but regular contacts with nationality group leaders, their organizations, and press.

There are dozens of ways in which American nationality groups can help in fighting the cold war, promoting better understanding of the United States, and strengthening democratic forces in their countries of origin. Once these groups realize that their activities are welcomed and appreciated, specific ideas are likely to multiply rapidly.

In addition to the overall job of surveying, stimulating, and guiding nationality group activities, there are a number of specific projects which could profitably be undertaken:

Expansion of letters from America campaign: In today's war of ideas, the letters

which our 35 million first- and second-generation Americans write abroad are one of the simplest, least costly, and most effective weapons. For the past 5 years, a letters from America campaign has been sponsored by the Common Council for American Unity. The campaign is an attempt to use these hundreds of millions of letters as a means of combating anti-American propaganda and overcoming European misconceptions about the United States. It was undertaken after the council had completed—with the advice of Mr. Elmo Roper—a survey of European beliefs regarding the United States. The campaign urges newer Americans to use their letters abroad to explain in personal terms what life in America is really like. To stimulate such letters, the council distributes a weekly column to the foreign-language press in 24 languages containing suggestions for telling the American story abroad.

At present, the campaign is conducted on a relatively modest scale because of the council's limited financial means. Its effectiveness could be increased if it were possible to provide weekly columns aimed specifically at each of the more important European countries instead of one general, broadside column. Wider personal contacts with editors, radio-program directors, and organization officials are also needed. Pictures and cartoons supplied foreign-language newspapers in mat form and transcriptions for radio stations would add to the campaign's reach and effectiveness.

A 10-minute film, *The Million Dollar Nickel*, has been produced at the council's request by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. It tells the story of the campaign, dramatizes the value of a 5-cent stamp on letters overseas, emphasizes the important role of newer citizens, and ends with appeals by Pier Angeli (in Italian), Ricardo Montalban (in Spanish), Eva Gabor (in Hungarian), and Leslie Caron (in French), for cooperation in the campaign. Funds are needed, however, to obtain general distribution of the film in the country's theaters.

The usefulness of the campaign might be further increased if arrangements could be made to coordinate the campaign as closely as possible with official Government strategy in the cold war.

#### WHO SHOULD UNDERTAKE THIS EXPANDED PROGRAM?

Many of the foregoing projects and the broad program of work with nationality groups which has been outlined, could be undertaken by the Government, or by a non-Government, semipublic agency like the common council, or divided between them.

During World War II, both the Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services had divisions working directly with nationality groups. Certainly, a Government agency would be likely to have far more adequate resources at its command than a private organization. On the other hand, it would have certain disadvantages. The effectiveness of many of the suggested projects depends on their voluntary, nonofficial character. In the whole field of psychological warfare, indeed, peoples abroad are likely to be suspicious of any activity traceable to an official United States Government source. Furthermore, nationality groups in this country might tend to resent suggestions, which, coming from the Government could be construed as dictation or interference with citizen activity. Also it might be difficult to get congressional approval for formal governmental participation in such a program at any time short of war.

As to private organizations, the number of those in a position to work effectively with nationality groups is extremely limited. Both the National Committee for a Free Europe and the American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism have done some excellent work with exiled leaders. But so far as it knows, the Common Council for

American Unity is the only organization equipped by knowledge and experience, broad contacts, and years of good will to do a job with nationality groups as a whole. If the Government feels it is not in a position to undertake the proposed program, the council would be glad to do so, if the necessary funds could be obtained. In such case, however, the council believes that the most effective results could be secured by some division, or informal sharing, of responsibility. So far as the public was concerned, the council could be responsible for what was done, but it would need to work in close cooperation with appropriate Government officials.

#### COMMON COUNCIL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH NATIONALITY GROUPS

The council is an outgrowth of work with nationality groups started by the Federal Government—through the United States Committee on Public Information—in World War I. Since 1921 it has been an independent nonprofit organization supported by voluntary contributions. It aims to assist the newcomer to understand American life and institutions, become a citizen and participate fully and effectively in American life.

For 35 years the council has been in intimate contact with American nationality groups, their press, radio and organizations. The council maintains a weekly press service in 25 languages to foreign language publications in the United States. It supplies a similar weekly educational service to foreign language radio programs and broadcasters. It has worked closely with nationality organizations on a wide range of projects, including the letters from America campaign, the 1952 register and vote campaign, etc. It maintains a technical information service on immigration and naturalization problems—interpreter releases—which is widely used throughout the country.

The council's information in these fields is undoubtedly the most complete and accurate that exists. So far as its resources permit, it reads the foreign language press in the United States and follows political and other developments within American nationality groups. On the basis of such information it has recently prepared a series of special articles and reports. Surveys of "Current Political Attitudes and Activities with Respect to their Country of Origin" have been made in regard to Polish-Americans, Ukrainian-Americans, Czech-Americans and some 15 other nationality groups. Other reports have included "Reactionary Influences in the Foreign Language Press and Organizations," "Anti-Bolshevist Bloc of Nations," "Promethean Movement in the U. S. A." It is now preparing for the Rand Corporation a series of reports on émigré groups from the Soviet Union. Reference has already been made to the council's survey of "European Beliefs Regarding the United States."

During its many years of work with nationality groups the council has not only acquired extensive information and experience, but has built up a vast amount of good will. Because of the confidence and trust which nationality groups have in the council, the flow of information and suggestions between these groups and the council is unusually frank and complete. They are accustomed to turn to the council with information they might be loath to give to an official agency, even if they knew to whom to go. Frequently, indeed, the council has served as a connecting link between them and the Government. In 1951 and 1952, for example, it organized nationality group conferences in Washington for the Mutual Security Agency.

As a result of all these things—experience, information, goodwill, Government contacts—the council is in a unique position to mobilize the invaluable assets our new Amer-

icans offer, if the means can be found to go forward with an expanded program.

#### WINNING THE COLD WAR

Who undertakes the proposed work with nationality groups is not so important as that the work itself be done. America owes its strength, in no small part, to the fact that its people have come from every part of the world, that we are a country of many nationalities, many races, many religions. Not to capitalize on this tremendous fact in psychological warfare is to miss one of our great opportunities in winning the war of ideas.

Because our newer citizens are less apt to take our basic freedoms for granted, they may be in a better position to combat the neutralism which exists in many countries and to arouse people to an appreciation of the spiritual issues which divide communism from the Western world. At a time, too, when attention is so much centered on the Soviet Union and the satellite countries, American nationality groups can be particularly helpful in the equally crucial area of Western Europe.

What makes this whole approach so important and effective is that it relies on natural and spontaneous lines of communication. Millions of Americans of foreign birth or descent are regularly writing their relatives and friends abroad and are otherwise in touch with their countries of origin. The suspicion that attaches to government propaganda does not apply to communications from relatives and friends and fellow countrymen. Here is an inestimable advantage. The opportunity is one whose specific potentialities are likely to increase rapidly as active work goes forward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, other groups in this country are making valuable contributions toward this goal of letter writing. It is a project which should offer a tremendous challenge to our young people particularly.

I want to call special attention to the work of an organization known as Youth of All Nations, Inc., seeking to build lasting peace through young understanding. This organization is dedicated to developing pen pals throughout the world. Young people of other lands are so eager for letters that thousands of more letter writers are needed in this country.

As an example, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter to me from five members of Youth of All Nations, appealing for more American pen pals to write to Asians and Africans. What could be more appropriate for us to encourage at this time?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The undersigned have personal friends in most of the countries represented at the Asian-African Conference being held in Indonesia. We think thousands of other Americans, now more interested in that important area, would also enjoy increasing their understanding of it through correspondence with individual Asians and Africans, if they just knew how to go about it. Will you then help us tell them?

Will you introduce your constituents to Youth of All Nations, Inc., a nonpolitical, nonprofit organization we belong to which makes such contacts possible? Say, please, that we invite all between the ages of 14 and 27 to join us. They will find membership informative, challenging, and fun. They will find our bulletin, *Mirror for Youth*, a

unique way to keep in touch with the thousands of members no one can write to personally.

YOAN helps youth everywhere, regardless of nation, race, or religious beliefs, to understand each other's ways and purposes through the only means available to most of mankind—the personal letter. How many of the world's people can, after all, be exchange students or even tourists? During the past 8 years our program has sparked hundreds of thousands of friendly international letters. As we are plain, not official, Americans, our overseas friends readily accept what we tell them about democratic life here. And we, as citizens of an old democracy, are watching the progress of the new democracies.

We believe you will welcome knowing of private enterprise like YOAN and will like the idea that, although it is informally helpful to that part of the Congress concerned with our country's foreign affairs, no Government funds are involved. Our work has, it happens, been praised before Congress by Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio Republican, in the *Democratic Digest*—September 1954 issue, and in important newspapers. Educational and religious leaders endorse it.

We urgently need more young Americans to write to our fellow YOAN-ers in Indonesia, the Philippines, Viet-Nam, Syria, India, Japan, the Gold Coast, etc., and thousands in Europe, Australia, Latin America, and various islands. For they all want a pen friend in the United States of America. So we, representing the United States members of Youth of All Nations, Inc., appeal for help. Anyone interested not only in telling the American story abroad but also in finding out more about average life in other countries should send a nickel and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to Clara Leiser, executive director, 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N. Y.

Thank you, sir, for aiding our efforts to improve international relations.

Respectfully,

YOUTH OF ALL NATIONS, INC.  
HENRY FERNANDEZ,  
AUDREY E. DAVIDSON,  
ROY BLUMENTHAL,  
NORMA JAEGER,  
RUTH SANDMAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope young America will respond eagerly to that appeal. It has been backed up to me in another letter from the executive director and moving spirit of Youth of All Nations, Clara Leiser. I ask unanimous consent for it to appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH OF ALL NATIONS, INC.,  
New York, N. Y., April 26, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I stress the urgency of the accompanying appeal? The five signers represent about 1,000 American "YOAN-ers," who are trying, valiantly, to satisfy many thousands of non-Americans waiting for a personal pen-friend in the United States of America. Can you mention the appeal in your weekly newsletter or radio report? We need thousands of active United States members to help convince youth the world over that this Nation is devoted to achieving a world at peace.

Right now there is high and special value for our country in the simple, forthright, friendly Youth of All Nations approach to youth overseas. We ask them, you see, what they want better known about their own



countries—what misconceptions they feel others have about them—what countries and people they find hard to understand. You might be surprised to see how often "the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A." appears.)

We keep track, too, of current articles and books on foreign affairs. The following very recent observation bears tellingly on our work in Asia. "Where the Government leaves off . . . private enterprise can begin. Individual Americans . . . can speak with a freedom and . . . with the diversity of points of view that is the true strength of democracy. . . . The private American can more easily enter into the free and uninhibited give-and-take of ideas on which our whole concept of democratic progress depends. . . . We should establish fruitful intellectual contacts at every possible level."

We believe the YOAN program responds to those recommendations, and we hope you will agree that our success thus far warrants our asking support to realize YOAN's full potential for United States and world good. Will you help us reach adults who would contribute supplies and/or money? These are income-tax deductible.

YOAN really is winning the minds of the young—and their hearts. But even our modest program requires funds. If, as one vitally concerned with the foreign relations of our country, you agree that American youth can be powerful private voices of America, will you help us to secure a grant from some foundation whose funds are available for peace-building?

Extra important is our small but really loved *Mirror for Youth*, in which "YOAN-ers" share what they learn from correspondence, and "Headquarters" share what we learn from them all. Want of funds has prevented our issuing MFY as often as we should. Thousands of fine young people are waiting for it.

For what you may do to help this down-to-earth program which works, thanks.

Sincerely,

CLARA LEISER.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this body has given considerable thought to problems of juvenile delinquency. I think it would be well to consider the comment of a young Minnesota girl, a new member of Youth of All Nations, Diane Clarity of International Falls, who wrote in her application to this organization:

It certainly gives you something constructive to do. If more kids had pen-pals, there would not be so much "juvenile delinquency."

Clara Leiser informs me that United States youth as a rule feels rather bitter about having the whole world think all United States youth is delinquent—as the nature and volume of this publicity given to juvenile delinquency could seem to make them think. Here is a great chance for youth to speak out for itself, and show young people of other lands the real backbone of American youth.

It has been somewhat embarrassing for leaders of this movement to have to tell many overseas members that there are not enough young Americans willing to become pen-pals and answer their questions about the United States of America, giving them an unfair impression that United States youth may be less concerned about contemporaries abroad than the latter are about them. All I think American youth needs is encouragement and the opportunity to

learn how many can take part in this great undertaking. They can be a great force for good, and help build for peace.

Let me suggest that anyone interested in furthering this work among young people get in touch with Youth for All Nations, 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N. Y.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD just two of thousands of typical comments about this program from the files of Youth of All Nations.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Vicki, an American young woman: "I'm a better newspaper reader these days. How come? I now have personal friends in 'headline countries.' I know how they view this or that about the United States of America, and what they want us to know about them. First-hand accounts of education in Maylaya, reaction to American foreign policy in Germany, little known customs of the Irish and the Greeks, have made me an avid reader of all world news, and now I would like to help your readers share my pleasure in 'YOAN-ing.'"

Jagjit, a member in India: "We [that is, he and his correspondents in four different countries] have developed a good understanding and friendlier world true to the spirit of the organization—YOAN. So much so that even our parents share our views. After this 1-year-old correspondence, I am fully conversant with almost all the traditions and customs of [my friends'] countries."

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 708 OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I received today a telegram from the National Wool Marketing Association telling me that a very disastrous amendment would be presented on the Senate floor; that they did not know the full import of the proposed amendment, but understood it to be an attack on cooperatives.

I can only suggest to those who sent the telegram that it is a strange message for me to receive, when I realize who it was who put wool into the Agricultural Act of 1954 by an amendment. I put it there because I thought it was good, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry agreed with me.

I believe it is bad policy to say that the cooperative associations shall be allowed to cast the votes of all their producer members. I believe that when they are paying taxes they ought to be given an opportunity to express themselves on the issue. Therefore, I had favored eliminating from the provisions of section 708 the part which reads as follows:

Approval or disapproval by cooperative associations shall be considered as approval or disapproval by the producers who are members of, stockholders in, or under contract with such cooperative association of producers.

I do not intend, however, to offer such an amendment without consultation with the Members of the Senate who come from wool-producing States and who have been very active in wool legislation. Almost without exception, they

have asked me to present this proposal in the form of a bill, which I intend to do.

I now ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill to amend section 708 of Public Law 690, 83d Congress, 2d session, in order that it may come properly before the committee and hearings may be held upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1980) to amend section 708 of Public Law 690 of the 83d Congress, 2d session (the Agricultural Act of 1954), introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I intend to say a few words about the amendment which has been discussed, and then for a few minutes I plan to discuss farm income in the United States, where it is going, and why it is going there.

I had considered offering an amendment to the bill which would not have been germane to it, but I was agreeable to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into a few moments ago which precluded any amendments which were not germane, because I had not intended to call up my amendment.

The very able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] referred to the fact that those of us who had felt that a different version of a repeal or a modification of section 348 should be adopted did not have much support in the hearings before his subcommittee; that there was only one witness who seemed to speak for it, and many persons who seemed to speak against it.

I would only say that not too long ago, I was reading a little play called *Enemy of the People*, written by a fine Norwegian playwright. He said that he had finally come to a certain conclusion, which was this: That the strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone.

In agricultural policy, frequently persons find it necessary to stand alone. If in this particular instance the Secretary of Agriculture, all the farm organizations, and all their cohorts were on one side, I am certain the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the junior Senator from New Mexico might continue in their position if they thought the proposal was a bad one.

I take only a line or two from the hearings. Much has been said about the benefits in the ACP payments. I certainly would not dispute that; but I would not want anyone to believe that ACP payments are any key to financial success for the farmers of the Nation. As I shall shortly point out, they are having a very difficult time. It is not be-

cause their ACP payments are cut down, nor will their situation be greatly benefited by an increase in the ACP payments. The testimony given by the Department of Agriculture on this bill, as it appears on page 7 of the hearings, is as follows:

In the first place, the average payment, that is, the average ACP payment, is less than \$100.

If that be true, then surely when farmers are suffering a declining income, running into the billions of dollars, even a few more dollars will not change their position.

In order to be certain of my own position on this matter, in the light of my own experience, I sent for a copy of the exhibit which I had attached to my income-tax statement filed on April 15 of this year, covering the operation of my farm in the year 1954. I find that I spent for salaries and wages, \$19,424; for repairs, \$4,290; for taxes, \$4,116; and on through the various items. My total expenses were \$44,150.71.

My total ACP payment was \$320.

I do not believe a \$320 drop on top of a \$44,000 expense will make the difference between success and failure on that particular farming venture.

But whether the American farmer gets more than 100 percent of parity or less than 100 percent of parity, whether he gets 90 percent or 75 percent in the marketplace, makes a great deal of difference.

The able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] started by pointing out that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar had gone down from 54 cents out of every dollar in 1947 or 1948 to 42 cents, and he said it is on its way down to 42 cents. I agree with him. In every one of those years we had 90-percent price supports. They did not save the American farmer from taking an awful licking. The American farmer does not have prosperity built up by any such system as that.

Not long ago a table was placed in the RECORD showing what the American farmer received in net farm income and its relationship to national income. Strangely, even in 1933 the national income was from 12 to 15 times the farm income.

In 1933 the net farm income was \$2,692,000,000. The national income was \$39,600,000,000.

So it went through the whole scale until the year 1947, when the total net farm income was \$16,774,000,000, while the national income was about \$198 billion.

Farm income throughout all that period had been moving up in parity with national income. It had not moved up the same number of dollars, but it had moved up to the same degree; it had kept pace with it.

The point was reached in 1947 where farm income was some \$16,750,000,000, and the national income was \$198 billion.

What has happened since that date? National income has gone up to \$300 billion. Has farm income kept pace with it? Farm income should have gone up \$6 billion or \$8 billion from the \$16,750,-

000,000 figure; but instead of going up, it went down to \$12 billion last year.

In every one of those years we had 90-percent price supports. So, I say, farm income cannot be increased merely by support prices, hard as we may try to do so by that device.

We have an agriculture which is enjoying an active, aggressive market. Adding a few dollars by this type of payment is not going to make the farmer well.

It is necessary to move off the shelves of this country the surpluses which now exist, and to get the farmer in a position where he can operate profitably again.

Three-dollar wheat got him well. One dollar and a half wheat does not seem to do so well for him.

I have sold lots of alfalfa at \$4, \$6, \$8, and \$10 a ton. But when in a particular period of shortage people came to my place and fought for it at \$45 a ton, I began to know what prosperity might be.

In an area in the north central States, \$6 a bushel was paid for flax. Farmers do pretty well on that basis.

So I simply believe that while it is true that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has dropped, and dropped drastically, we should be spending our time trying to find ways by which his lost portion of the consumer's dollar can be restored. We cannot accomplish that unless there is control of commodities which are bringing about excessive surpluses in this land.

One of the speakers today said that in a year's time it had been found that the provision written into the Agricultural Act a year ago was detrimental to soil conservation. How that could have been ascertained when the provision has not been in operation, I do not know. However, I did find something I thought was very interesting. The American Agricultural Limestone Institute, which is located in Washington, on May 3, 1955, sent to persons interested in the agricultural conservation program a message dealing with the subject of soil-conservation payments. The message was signed by the executive secretary, Mr. Koch, who has long struggled to see that limestone shall be sold to the farmers throughout this country.

He said:

A week ago today the Senate, in the most unusual action since I have been associated with the agricultural conservation program, overwhelmingly approved continuing the ACP for 1956—

That is next year—

at the \$250 million level. The administration originally requested \$175 million from the House and then, after it was passed by the House at \$250 million, it asked the Senate to reduce the amount to \$175 million.

He points out that when the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] sought to reduce the amount to \$195 million, the Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote of 76 to 5, approved the amount of \$250 million.

I would say that soil conservation generally was getting along pretty well. I voted to keep the amount at \$250 million. I think that is where it belongs.

I do not believe we have destroyed soil conservation by this act, which has not become effective.

In the hearings, on page 10, there is a table showing the reduction in crops which has taken place. The table showed that seeded acres of wheat had been reduced from 78,789,000 acres in 1953 to a 1955 allotment of 55 million acres, a reduction of 23,789,000 acres.

Why should not we try to do something about the condition that brought that about? The condition that brought it about was the accumulation of a surplus of 1 billion bushels of wheat which cannot be moved to the markets of the earth. I do not believe that condition can be cured by \$250 million or \$195 million for soil conservation. The loss of a market for that wheat is a staggering blow to the farmers, and I believe the attention of the Committees on Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture should be primarily directed to the conditions which have brought that about and not to some other issue which I do not think would be of help to the American farmer.

The table to which I referred also shows that seeded acres of cotton were reduced from approximately 25 million acres to approximately 18 million acres in the 1955 allotment. The same table shows that corn acreage was reduced from 57,007,000 in 1953 to 49,842,697 in 1955. There was a reduction of approximately 38 million acres in those 3 crops alone.

I do not believe we will ever get to a prosperous condition for American agriculture until we start finding ways by which the surpluses hanging over the markets can be moved. I do not think they can be moved unless there is a strong aggressive program to move them.

I have regretted that in the discussion some Senators interested in agriculture have been worrying too much about the language of this particular amendment when a condition such as I have described has been going on, and American farmers have to steadily cut down their cotton and wheat acreage and resort to all sorts of devices in order to get increased production from their land.

A publication on the table before me carries a report on cotton acreage production. It shows that the number of bales produced in 1954 was 13,679,000. That was 2,786,000 bales less than the 1953 crop, but it was greater than the 10-year average.

I thought it might be interesting to have the figures broken down, so I have before me a table which shows the cotton acreage harvested in 1952, 1953, and 1954, then the lint yield per harvested acre, and then finally the number of bales produced.

It will be seen that in the State of Arizona there was produced 673 pounds an acre in 1952, 743 pounds an acre in 1953, and 1,039 pounds an acre when the acreage reduction became effective in 1954.

It will be seen that the lint yield per acre in the cotton-growing States increased from 279 pounds in 1952 to 324 pounds in the following year.



Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Cotton acreage harvested, lint yield per acre, and production, 1952-54*

	Acreage harvested			Lint yield per harvested acre			Bales produced (500 pounds gross weight)		
	1952	1953	1954	1952	1953	1954	1952	1953	1954
	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Thousand acres	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Thousand bales	Thousand bales	Thousand bales
North Carolina.....	745	775	545	366	278	319	569	449	364
South Carolina.....	1,140	1,175	830	276	281	288	657	690	501
Georgia.....	1,455	1,375	1,025	241	262	286	731	752	612
Tennessee.....	860	950	648	355	354	405	638	702	548
Alabama.....	1,585	1,620	1,170	269	285	298	890	963	728
Mississippi.....	2,416	2,490	1,960	378	410	384	1,906	2,129	1,571
Missouri.....	515	555	450	367	386	478	394	449	450
Arkansas.....	1,940	2,070	1,700	337	358	380	1,366	1,548	1,351
Louisiana.....	890	950	688	408	407	399	756	806	572
Oklahoma.....	1,220	1,020	930	104	205	151	264	437	293
Texas.....	10,700	8,900	7,730	171	233	244	3,808	4,317	3,923
New Mexico.....	295	315	204	536	497	743	330	327	316
Arizona.....	674	690	420	673	743	1,039	948	1,070	911
California.....	1,386	1,340	883	628	632	806	1,818	1,768	1,487
Other States <sup>1</sup> .....	100	116	68	307	242	367	64	58	52
United States.....	25,921	24,341	19,251	279.9	324.2	341	15,139	16,465	13,679
Other States: <sup>2</sup>									
Virginia.....	26.0	30.0	17.1	424	291	285	23.0	18.0	10.2
Florida.....	60.0	71.0	36.2	249	182	332	31.0	27.0	25.0
Illinois.....	2.2	2.3	3.0	180	357	444	.8	1.7	2.8
Kentucky.....	10.0	10.1	9.6	346	480	588	7.2	10.1	11.8
Nevada.....	1.5	2.3	1.8	569	325	561	1.8	1.6	2.1
American-Egyptian: <sup>3</sup>									
Texas.....	36.0	30.0	11.5	431	329	471	32.4	20.6	11.3
New Mexico.....	21.6	20.1	6.7	399	289	457	18.1	12.1	6.4
Arizona.....	48.0	41.5	15.8	436	375	732	43.8	32.5	24.2
California.....	1.2	.5	.2	258	246	505	.7	.3	.2
Total American-Egyptian.....	106.8	92.1	34.2	425	340	589	95.0	65.5	42.1

<sup>1</sup> Sums of acreage and production for "other States" rounded to thousands for inclusion in United States totals. Estimates for these States, except Kansas where cotton production is insignificant, are shown separately.

<sup>2</sup> Included in State and United States totals.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Crop Reporting Board.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we will find the production per acre is going to continue to increase not only in cotton but in wheat, in corn, and in many other commodities, as long as we try to solve this problem only by constant reduction in acreage allotments.

While I am not worried about the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida—I think it is a good thing to bring this into balance—I have tried to say to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that we need to spend time trying to find out why it is that, even with production increases, agricultural income is steadily going down year after year. It is a tragedy that the American farmer, producing, as he is, intelligently for the American market, is faced with a return which is already nearly \$5 billion below the 1947 figure, while his share of the increased national income should have been at least \$7 billion. He is \$12 billion short. We cannot have that condition existing without farmers looking for additional ways to get increased production, by changing the width between rows of intertilled crops, or by trying to increase production with the use of new types of fertilizer—all of which throws the whole production picture out of balance.

I intend to vote for the Holland amendment which was offered not because I think it is a cure-all, not particularly because I liked the bill passed a year ago in that respect, but because I think we need to be saying constantly that there should be some way of encouraging acreage limitations. This may not

be the way, but some way needs to be adopted. Otherwise we will be out of step.

When we begin to enforce the limitations we begin to come up against surplus acreages. Then we come up against the problem of surpluses and ways to dispose of the commodities produced.

I do not believe this Government has made nearly as vigorous an effort as it should to dispose of the surpluses now on hand. I believe the first duty of the Agriculture Committees of both the Senate and the House should be to discover additional ways of disposing of the surpluses which overhang the market, and which affect the sale of every bushel of agricultural commodities produced on the lands of this country. We cannot have one billion bushels of surplus wheat without affecting production. We cannot have 10 million bales of cotton on hand without influencing the price of cotton, although the price of cotton is not affected so much as are the prices of other commodities, since cotton is readily stored. That is why we have adopted the program we now have with respect to cotton.

I hope the Senate will not lose sight of what I think is the first problem, and that is to find markets for the surpluses by an alert and vigorous program.

#### RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, May 17, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

##### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

##### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan, elevated to the United States Supreme Court.

Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Harrie B. Chase, retired.

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Kenneth P. Grubb, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, to fill a new position.

##### CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army.

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

##### LINE

Abdon, Albert L.	Balko, William J.
Ackerman, Eugene B.	Barck, Dale E.
Ackerman, Warren J.	Bardecki, Frank J.
Ackley, Richard T.	Bardes, Charles R.
Acton, James B.	Barker, Franklin H.
Aillaud, Emmett R., Jr.	Barker, Raymond H.
Albright, Donald S., Jr.	Barker, Warren W.
Allen, James A.	Barnard, Robert W.
Allen, Jesse L.	Barnette, Curtis L.
Allen, Raymond C.	Barnhart, Robert W.
Allen, Thomas R.	Barrineau, Edwin
Allison, Paul	Barron, Joseph M.
Anderson, Lee C.	Barrow, Joseph J.
Anderson, Lyle C.	Basso, Robert J.
Anderson, Robert G.	Bates, George M.
Andresen, Ronald N.	Baty, Edward M.
Angleman, Cornell C.	Beavers, Robert A.
Anthony, John D., Jr.	Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Arbuckle, Wallace D., Jr.	Becker, Donald A.
Archer, Martin D.	Beckman, Kenneth L.
Arnold, Henry D.	Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Arnold, Julian M.	Belter, Robert H.
Arnold, William S. M.	Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.	Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.	Bennett, Robert W.
Augustine, William F.	Bennie, Ralph F.
Austin, Fuller A.	Bereiter, Edward A.
Averett, Thomas R., Jr.	Bergeron, Roy L.
Axe, John R.	Bergman, Daniel
Axell, Charles L.	Bergstrom, James H.
Ayres, William H., Jr.	Bigenho, Roy M.
Babcock, Robert E.	Bigley, Thomas J.
Bacheller, Frank E.	Biles, Joel T.
Backstrom, Robert I.	Billings, John H.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.	Billings, Randall K.
Baggett, Talmadge S.	Bircher, William B.
Bagley, Ralph F., Jr.	Blaha, Albert J.
Bailey, Gilliam M.	Blaney, William C., Jr.
Bailey, Henry G.	Block, Peter F.
Bailey, William C.	Boggs, Gilbert A.
Baker, Richard L.	Bond, John R.
	Bonekamp, Fred H.
	Bossert, Richard M.
	Boston, Leo
	Bottom, George A., 3d

- Bowersox, Franklin L. Corbin, Rex G.  
 Boyd, David S. Cossaboom, William  
 Bradberry, Richard F. M., II  
 Bradford, John W., Jr. Costello, Daniel J.  
 Bradford, William Costello, Peter M., Jr.  
 J. D., 3d Coughlin, John T.  
 Brady, Gene P. Covington, Gerald E.  
 Bramley, Leslie G. Cowhill, William J.  
 Brandorff, Paul A. Cramblet, Frank  
 Branson, John J., Jr. Cross, Daniel F.  
 Brett, Morton Crow, Dayl E.  
 Brick, John H. Crow, Edwin M.  
 Bristol, Edward R., Jr. Crowl, Otho W.  
 Brooks, William T., Jr. Cruse, Donald A.  
 Brown, Charles "D" Crytser, William B.  
 Brown, Ernest B. Culp, John B., Jr.  
 Brown, James W. Cunningham, Russell  
 Brown, Robert S. P., Jr.  
 Brown, William E. Cusack, Warren J.  
 Bruce, Forrest T. Czernicki, Leonard  
 Brumbach, Lawrence Dagg, Robert M.  
 E. Dame, Harold E.  
 Bryan, Thomas S. Darfus, George H.  
 Buck, Robert A. Darnell, Donald P.  
 Buck, Roger L. Davi, Jerome A.  
 Burden, James D. Davidson, Harrison  
 Burks, Ernest, Jr. W., Jr.  
 Burnett, Carl J., Jr. Davidson, Richard S.  
 Burnett, James C. Davis, Allen B.  
 Burson, Roger T. Davis, Frederick P.  
 Burt, Alexander R., Davis, Jack W.  
 Jr. Davis, Robert L.  
 Burton, James L. Day, Lawrence C.  
 Bustard, Francis W. Deibler, Daniel T.  
 Buteau, Bernard L. Dellinger, Donald B.  
 Butzen, Thomas P. DeLoach, Walter M.  
 Byron, Herbert I. DeLozier, Richard G.  
 Byron, John B. DeMers, William H.,  
 Cady, John P., Jr. 2d Denmark, George T.  
 Caglione, Joseph, Jr. Dennis, James M.  
 Caldwell, Ronald H. Dickinson, Richard A.  
 Calhoun, William P. Dickson, James D.  
 Cameron, Allan K., Jr. Diehl, William F.  
 Campbell, Donald H. Dillahunt, Benjamin  
 Campbell, James S. P.  
 Campbell, Norman R. Dille, Earl K.  
 Canaan, Gerald C. Doak, Samuel L.  
 Carberry, James P., Jr. Doan, Richard C.  
 Cariker, Jess L., Jr. Dollinger, Richard E.  
 Carlton, George A. Dorsa, Theodore, Jr.  
 Carmichael, Robert C. Downs, Leslie R.  
 Carr, William K. Doyle, Richard B.  
 Carter, Frank R. Draddy, John M.  
 Casey, Edward J., Jr. Dreesen, Robert F.  
 Cassilly, Frank R. Driscoll, Jerome M.  
 Chaitin, Neil D. Duggan, Frederick F.,  
 Chambers, John J. Jr.  
 Chanaud, Henry L. Duggan, Richard W., II  
 Chapman, Donald E. Dukes, Warren C.  
 Chapman, George T. Dunaway, Gene T.  
 Jr. Dunn, Charles C., Jr.  
 Chappell, Lawrence A. Dunn, Delma D.  
 Charnas, Steve C. Dunning, Frederick S.,  
 Chipman, Eugene N. Jr.  
 Choyce, Charles V. Dupnik, Joseph J.  
 Church, Clifford E., Jr.  
 Jr. Eagye, Thomas R., 2d  
 Clark, Fred P., Jr. East, George W.  
 Clarke, Michael Ebelacker, Richard M.  
 Clarke, Walter L., Jr. Eckerd, George E.  
 Clemens, Porter E. Eckert, Earl J., Jr.  
 Clithero, John D. Edwards, Frederick A.,  
 Cobb, George B., Jr. Jr.  
 Cochran, James A. Ellena, Eugene D.  
 Cogdell, John B. Elliott, James D.  
 Cole, Charles W. Emerson, David F.  
 Coleman, Eddie T., Jr. Emlet, Harold B.  
 Coleman, Frank S. Engel, Paul H.  
 Coleman, Gerald G. Engle, Raymond E.  
 Colleary, John E., Jr. English, Ernest C., Jr.  
 Collins, Robert S. Enright, George E.  
 Colvin, Robert D. Epeneter, Gus W., Jr.  
 Comerford, James N. Estes, Leland F.  
 Concannon, Leslie E. Estes, Windom L.  
 Condit, Maurice J. Everett, Elmer C.  
 Congdon, Walter R. Ewertz, Roy W., Jr.  
 Conlon, Charles M. Fahland, Frank R.  
 Jr. Falkenstein, Rudolph  
 Conroy, Thomas P. F.  
 Cook, Richard M. Farnsworth, William  
 Cooper, David L. B., Jr.  
 Cooper, Jack E.
- Farrell, John B.  
 Fassula, Richard F.  
 Faulkenberry, Virgil  
 T.  
 Feagin, Frederick K.  
 Fears, Donald G.  
 Featherston, Frank H.  
 Fendorf, James E.  
 Fenno, Eric N.  
 Ferguson, George D.,  
 III  
 Ferrier, Harry H.  
 Ferrucci, David E.  
 Finley, Alden G.  
 Finley, Hugh D.  
 Fish, Theodore T.  
 Fitzpatrick, John R.  
 Fleming, Francis L.,  
 Jr.  
 Fleming, Joseph P.  
 Fleming, Michael J. J.  
 Fleming, William O.  
 Fletcher, James L.  
 Flynn, Richard E.  
 Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.  
 Forbes, Donald K.  
 Forster, William G.  
 Forsyth, James A.  
 Forsythe, Forrest  
 Foscatto, Sydney E., Jr.  
 Foster, James R.  
 Foster, Paul L.  
 Foucht, Richard A.  
 Fowler, Arthur D., Jr.  
 Fox, Albert D.  
 Fox, George A., Jr.  
 Fox, Richard T.  
 Fraasa, Donald G.  
 Frazier, Montgomery  
 L.  
 French, Norman M., Jr.  
 French, Robert D.  
 Frerichs, John S.  
 Friesen, Edwin "J"  
 Fritsch, Thomas D.  
 Frosio, Robert C.  
 Frudden, Mark P.  
 Fry, Gayle A.  
 Galloway, Charles R.,  
 Jr.  
 Gamble, Francis T.  
 Garland, John C.  
 Garside, Joseph J.  
 Geist, Richard A.  
 Gelitz, Kenneth L.  
 Geraud, Joseph R.  
 Gibson, Charles L.  
 Gillespie, Edward A.  
 Gilpin, Burton H.  
 Gilyard, John G.  
 Gire, Harold W.  
 Gobble, George F.  
 Gochenour, David T.  
 Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.  
 Goldman, Howard A.  
 Goode, Martin  
 Gooding, Niles R., Jr.  
 Goodspeed, Richard E.  
 Goodwin, Edmund E.  
 Goodwin, George E.  
 Gott, Herschel L.  
 Gray, Rockwell M., Jr.  
 Greeley, William E.  
 Greene, Leonard B.  
 Greenwood, Charles L.  
 Greer, Wiley W.  
 Gregory, George T.  
 Grier, Joseph L.  
 Griffin, Ellegood V., Jr.  
 Griffith, Thomas J.  
 Grigg, William H.  
 Grimm, William F.  
 Grosvenor, Alexander  
 G. B.  
 Grote, Joseph C.  
 Grove, Michael M.  
 Grunwald, Edward A.  
 Gully, Robert L.  
 Gureck, William A.  
 Gutknecht, Lowell E.  
 Hage, Lealand P.
- Hahn, William S.  
 Hall, Donald P.  
 Hall, Harold D.  
 Halleland, Henry L.  
 Hamer, Robert R., Jr.  
 Hammer, Theodore J.,  
 Jr.  
 Hancock, Virgil R.  
 Hanson, Carl T.  
 Hanson, Richard W.  
 Hardgrave, James B.  
 Hardin, David L.  
 Hardy, Corydon C.  
 Hardy, Martin E.  
 Harkness, Richard E.  
 Harkness, Vinton O.,  
 Jr.  
 Harris, Dale B.  
 Harris, Edgar S., Jr.  
 Harris, John  
 Harris, Richard D.  
 Harris, Robert D., Jr.  
 Harris, Thomas J., Jr.  
 Harrison, James R.  
 Hartwell, Ralf L., Jr.  
 Harvey, John W.  
 Haselton, Waring B.,  
 Jr.  
 Hawkins, Larry L.  
 Hayes, Robert W.  
 Haynes, Richard D.  
 Hays, Ronald J.  
 Heerwagen, David D.  
 Henderson, Stanley W.  
 Henderson, Burton  
 Henning, John C., 3d  
 Henry, Martin H.  
 Hershel, John A.  
 Hlatt, Henry G., Jr.  
 Highberg, Roy W.  
 Hight, Albee D.  
 Hill, Allen E.  
 Hill, Jackson D.  
 Hill, Lester N.  
 Hilscher, Carl C.  
 Hoare, Robert E.  
 Hoffman, Robert D.  
 Hoffman, Samuel D.  
 Hofstra, Edward J.  
 Hoge, Kenneth G., Jr.  
 Hohn, Henry E.  
 Hollack, Michael  
 Holloman, George H.  
 Holman, Rockwell  
 Holmes, John S.  
 Hopkins, Clifford D.  
 Hopkins, Mark, Jr.  
 Hopkins, William H. P.  
 Hornbeck, Donald R.  
 Hoseman, Leland J.  
 Howard, Joseph B.  
 Howe, James A.  
 Hubbard, William F.,  
 Jr.  
 Huber, James W.  
 Huelsbeck, Gerald  
 Huff, Mahlon S.  
 Hughes, Frank W., Jr.  
 Hughes, Ray S.  
 Hughes, Wayne L.  
 Hugo, William P.  
 Hunt, Donald B., Jr.  
 Huntsman, Gary S.  
 Hussmann, Harry "L",  
 III  
 Huth, Ralph L.  
 Ingram, Billy G.  
 Irish, George E.  
 Jacobson, Jacob H., Jr.  
 Jaeger, Adolphus F.  
 Jakimier, Beverly G.  
 Jarrell, Donald L.  
 Jefferson, Robert R.  
 Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.  
 Jenista, John E.  
 Jensen, Arlo J.  
 Jensen, Edwin F.  
 Jensen, Wayne L.  
 Jessen, George E.  
 Johns, Ronald L.  
 Johnson, Daniel C.
- Johnson, Homer R.  
 Johnson, Ian J.  
 Johnson, Merlin L.  
 Johnson, Phillip T.  
 Johnson, Richard L.  
 Johnson, Richard "D"  
 Johnson, Robert W.  
 Johnson, Willard E.  
 Jones, Cecil B., Jr.  
 Jones, Hubert A., Jr.  
 Jones, John P.  
 Jordan, Watt W., Jr.  
 Kaessinger, Charles E.  
 Kaiser, Robert D.  
 Kangas, Robert T.  
 Karns, Dane L.  
 Kaufman, Richard F.  
 Kaune, James E.  
 Kearney, John R.  
 Keeler, Donald J.  
 Keever, Robert J.  
 Keihner, James K.  
 Kelley, Bruce E.  
 Kelly, Ellis G.  
 Kelly, Ronald T.  
 Kelly, William P., Jr.  
 Kempf, Cecil J.  
 Kennedy, James R., Jr.  
 Kersch, Roger N.  
 Ketchmark, Giles J.  
 Kidd, Owen A.  
 Klehl, William A.  
 Kiernan, Warren R.  
 Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.  
 Kimball, Edwin D.  
 King, Robert A.  
 King, Robert L.  
 King, Thomas R.  
 Kingery, Samuel G.  
 Kingsbury, Ben P.  
 Kirkhorn, Robert L.  
 Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.  
 Kittler, James P.  
 Kivlen, Alexander L.  
 Kjeldgaard, Peter D.  
 Knecht, Harry B.  
 Knights, Charles E.  
 Knutson, Creighton R.  
 Kolstad, Tom I.  
 Kost, John D., Jr.  
 Krag, Robert L.  
 Kramer, George  
 Krantzman, Harry M.  
 Kraus, Rudolf L.  
 Kremer, John L.  
 Kretchman, Frank C.  
 Krohn, Stanley W.  
 Kropf, John F.  
 Kuuls, Roderick J.  
 Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.  
 Kyle, Richard A.  
 Ladner, Ivan M.  
 Lally, William K., Jr.  
 Lamson, James L.  
 Langton, Charles E.,  
 Jr.  
 Laque, Harold A.  
 Larish, David C.  
 Lasell, Max H.  
 Lasley, William W.  
 Lassiter, Will E.  
 Lattin, Norman F.  
 Lawler, William G., Jr.  
 Lawrence, Gregory E.,  
 Jr.  
 Lawrence, John V.  
 LeDew, Thomas A.  
 Lee, Byron A.  
 Lee, Robert L., Jr.  
 Lefler, Luther  
 Lehman, Donald A.  
 Lemon, Robert T.  
 Leser, John R.  
 Leue, David E.  
 Lewis, Daniel A.  
 Lewis, William W., Jr.  
 Lindbeck, Edwin E.  
 Lintner, Richard W.  
 Lipchak, Edward A.  
 Linsanby, James W.  
 Littell, Raymond W.
- Little, James G.  
 Lockwood, Harold R.  
 Long, Charles R.  
 Long, Donald C.  
 Loomis, Aubrey K.  
 Lord, Warren W.  
 Losey, Willis M.  
 Loux, Raymond E.  
 Loyd, Rupert H.  
 Lyman, Jack N.  
 Lynam, Donald M.  
 Lynch, Robert M.  
 Lyttle, James D.  
 Mackell, Richard A.  
 Mackenzie, John D.  
 Mackey, Robert R.  
 Madera, Hary P.  
 Maegli, Richard E.  
 Mahon, Richard B.  
 Maier, Charles W., Jr.  
 Maier, William J., Jr.  
 Maire, Rex E.  
 Malloy, John E.  
 Mandeville, Robert C.  
 Jr.  
 Mangus, Thomas B.  
 Mann, Earl  
 Manning, Richard T.  
 Mantz, Roy T.  
 Marcellus, Russell A.  
 Marlin, Hubert A.  
 Marr, William F.  
 Marsh, Albert B.  
 Martin, Gene A.  
 Martin, Richard W.  
 Martin, William K.  
 Mason, Robert C.  
 Mason, Sidney R.  
 Massa, Emdiddio  
 Mathis, Paul J.  
 Matson, Willis A., II  
 Mauney, Thomas C.  
 May, Daryle C.  
 May, Donald S.  
 May, Harry L.  
 Mayer, Joseph C.  
 Maynard, Frank T.  
 McNulty, Robert M.,  
 Jr.  
 McArthur, John C.  
 McCarthy, Richard L.  
 McBroom, William A.  
 McCarthy, James P.,  
 Jr.  
 McClain, Kirby L., III  
 McClaran, Stephen W.  
 McClure, James R.  
 McConnell, Joseph E.  
 McCrary, Deway W.  
 McCraw, Frank M., Jr.  
 McDonnell, Harold A.  
 McFall, Albert D.  
 McGarrath, William E.  
 Jr.  
 McGlaughlin, Thomas  
 H.  
 McGuyre, Thomas A.  
 McJunkin, Russell E.,  
 Jr.  
 McKay, Robert B.  
 McKee, Richard W.  
 McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.  
 McLemore, Albert S.  
 McMurray, William C.  
 McNabney, John F.  
 McNally, John J., Jr.  
 McQueen, Ralph E.  
 Mealy, Daniel N.  
 Meek, Donald B.  
 Meetze, James C.  
 Mello, Gilbert D.  
 Melton, Frank D.  
 Meyer, Frank G.  
 Michaud, Robert A.  
 Miesner, John A., Jr.  
 Miguel, Theodore, Jr.  
 Miller, Alfred E.  
 Miller, Byron K.  
 Miller, Marvin J.  
 Miller, Raymond L.  
 Miller, Richard A.



- Miller, Thomas G., Jr. Pester, Benjamin H.  
 Miller, William A. Pester, Fred J.  
 Millpointer, Edward D. Peterman, Edward E.  
 Mills, Joseph E. Peters, Lyle R.  
 Minnis, Marion L., Jr. Pettit, Royce E., Jr.  
 Moberly, Richard O., Jr. Petty, William G.  
 Moffett, Russell G. Pezzel, Engelbert G.  
 Molling, Carl H. Pfeiffer, King W.  
 Molnar, Joseph J. Pickering, Richard C.  
 Monroe, Robert R. Platte, William A.  
 Montague, Lloyd L. Pleasants, John B.  
 Moore, Howard B. Pond, Richard E.  
 Moore, Thomas L. Porter, Thomas  
 Moore, William F. Portnoy, Howard R.  
 Morin, Gene D. Pouliot, Jean R.  
 Morris, Donald R. Powell, Samuel F., III  
 Morrison, Lewis E. Powell, James R., Jr.  
 Morrissey, John N. Prange, Eugene H.  
 Moss, Robert Prehn, Frederick A., Jr.  
 Muck, Floyd R. Prescott, Richard J.  
 Mudrock, John Preston, Frank W.  
 Mull, Charles L., II Preston, Joseph M., Jr.  
 Muller, Justus A. Price, Allen B.  
 Muller, Leonard A. Price, Byron  
 Murphy, Frank "M", Jr. Pride, Alfred M.  
 Murphy, Garrison E. Prince, Gordon A.  
 Myer, George W. Profflet, Leo T.  
 Myers, Charles B. Proper, Worthy "F"  
 Myers, Raymond W. Pullis, Joe H.  
 Nall, Delbert L. Pullar, Andrew, Jr.  
 Neander, Stanley B. Purvis, Elvis E.  
 Neiger, Ralph E. Putnam, Charles L.  
 Neithercott, Robert A. Putnam, Gerrie P.  
 Nelson, George G. Quid, Marvin M., Jr.  
 Nelson, Harry J., Jr. Quigley, Donovan B.  
 Nelson, Marvin D., Jr. Racy, Louis P.  
 Nelson, Robert L. Radcliffe, Roderick T.  
 Nelson, William R. Ramirez-Rodriguez, Fernando  
 Netro, Robert J. Ramsey, Russell B.  
 Neustel, Arthur D. Rasmussen, James P., Jr.  
 Newark, Theodore E. Newman, James F.  
 Nicel, Emile W. Rau, William F.  
 Nichol, Monte B. Reagan, John H.  
 Niesse, John E. Reddick, James P., Jr.  
 Ninnis, Robert V. Redmond, John G.  
 Nix, Henry J. Reed, Sherman C.  
 Noble, James K., Jr. Reichl, Charles J.  
 Noble, Thomas I. Reid, Eugene L.  
 Noonan, John M. Resek, Lawrence II.  
 Nordan, Emile E. Reyn, William P.  
 Nordyke, Cutlar J. Reynolds, Kenneth C.  
 Notz, Robert C. Ricci, William J.  
 Nulton, Frank I. Rice, Minor T.  
 Nussbaumer, John J. Richards, William L., Jr.  
 Oakes, Raymond H. Ricker, Stanley S.  
 Oberholtzer, James P. Risser, James B.  
 Oberle, Ronald R. Robbins, Donald K.  
 O'Brien, John W. Robertson, Charles G., Jr.  
 O'Connor, Francis E. Robertson, John W.  
 O'Donel, James H. Robinson, James A.  
 Odorina, Stephen R. Robinson, Thomas W., Jr.  
 Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr. Robisch, Herbert E.  
 Ohs, Karl E. Rochester, Carl W.  
 Oliver, Robert P. Rodgers, James F.  
 O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr. Roebuck, James W.  
 O'Reilly, James P., Jr. Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.  
 Orem, Charles A. Rosendahl, Edmund I.  
 Otten, Henry E. Rosenquist, Donald E.  
 Ottensmeyer, Robert Ross, Thomas H.  
 M. Roth, Franklin H.  
 Owen, Charles K. Roth, Robert D.  
 Palmatier, Philip F. Rowe, Bruce W.  
 Palmer, Gary H. Rowe, John D.  
 Palmquist, John R. Royal, Lee R.  
 Parce, James R. Rubins, Fredrick K.  
 Parent, Gerald "J" Ruble, Byron C.  
 Parker, James W. Rudy, Bryan C.  
 Parode, Harlan D. Rule, Adrian O., 3d  
 Parrish, William I. Rulls, Robert A.  
 Paschal, Joseph B., Jr. Rumble, Maurice W.  
 Pausner, Joseph J., Jr. Rutledge, Howard E.  
 Pelton, Robert L. Ryan, John J., Jr.  
 Pennington, Otis G. Ryan, Philip J.  
 Perkins, William L., Jr. Sacarob, Merwin  
 Perry, Frank M., Jr.  
 Perryman, Donald B.
- Salter, Winston W.  
 Sample, Richard J.  
 Sample, Robert J.  
 Sands, James W.  
 Satre, Robert S.  
 Sattler, Donald C.  
 Sax, Joe  
 Schaub, Robert L.  
 Scheller, William F.  
 Schenker, Marvin L.  
 Scherrer, Orvil D.  
 Schettino, Joseph N.  
 Schmidt, Ray A.  
 Schoelen, Lawrence A.  
 Schultz, Jesse Z.  
 Schultz, Milton J., Jr.  
 Schwab, Robert W.  
 Scribner, Henry I., Jr.  
 Seeman, David B.  
 Seipp, Russell M.  
 Semeraro, Angelo P.  
 Shafer, Walter R.  
 Shannon, Rickard W.  
 Sharpe, William K.  
 Shartel, Howard A.  
 Shea, Paul W.  
 Sheehan, Charles A.  
 Sheffield, Hughie D.  
 Sheridan, William R.  
 Sherin, Joseph E.  
 Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.  
 Shick, George B., Jr.  
 Shields, William B.  
 Shipman, Junious E.  
 Shultz, Robert T.  
 Siegmeister, Robert  
 Siler, James R.  
 Simcox, James G.  
 Simensen, Richard E.  
 Singer, Arnold N.  
 Singleton, Floyd R.  
 Sirrine, Jack D.  
 Skalla, Derald Z.  
 Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.  
 Skorheim, Robert D.  
 Slankard, Max L.  
 Sleeper, Sherwin J.  
 Sliwinski, Daniel J.  
 Smith, Allan R.  
 Smith, Edgar M., Jr.  
 Smith, Jerome W.  
 Smith, Leon W.  
 Smith, Melbourne L.  
 Smith, Thomas M.  
 Smith, Wayne F.  
 Smith, William D.  
 Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.  
 Smoot, William N.  
 Snyder, Collins  
 Snyder, John C.  
 Snyder, Roy D., Jr.  
 Solinger, David A.  
 Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.  
 Somogy, Roy S.  
 Sorg, George A.  
 Southall, Walter E., Jr.  
 Space, David J.  
 Sparks, Harold A., Jr.  
 Spayde, Keith C., Jr.  
 Speer, Paul H.  
 Speller, Jack E.  
 Spiller, John H., Jr.  
 Spowart, David J., Jr.  
 Springer, Roy M., Jr.  
 Sproull, Howard E., Jr.  
 Stack, Richard A.  
 Stanley, Donald E.  
 Stanley, Gregory W.  
 Stapp, Aron L.  
 Steentofte, Eric H.  
 Stella, Edward C.  
 Stimler, Richard P.  
 St. John, Alvin P.  
 St. Louis, Norman E.  
 Stollenwerck, William M.
- Stone, Bruce G.  
 Storey, Joseph D.  
 Strelch, Paul R.  
 Stroupe, Keith K.  
 Stull, Donald  
 St. Ville, Edward L.  
 Sudhoff, Herbert A.  
 Sullivan, Don M.  
 Summers, Gilbert L.  
 Sundstrom, Alex L.  
 Sutherland, Donald G.  
 Swadener, John R.  
 Swanson, Carl W., Jr.  
 Switzer, James R.  
 Sybdon, William  
 Szymanski, Andrew G.  
 Taft, Dillian W.  
 Tagliente, Joseph P.  
 Taylor, Francis C.  
 Taylor, John K.  
 Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.  
 Taylor, Robert E.  
 Terrell, Fred W., Jr.  
 Thom, Norman R.  
 Thomas, Robert L.  
 Thomas, Walter R.  
 Thompson, James J.  
 Thompson, John A., Jr.  
 Thompson, James E.  
 Thompson, Robert L.  
 Thompson, Robert C.  
 Thompson, Theodore O.  
 Thompson, William B., Jr.  
 Thornburg, Thomas H.  
 Thurston, Dick W.  
 Thyberg, Robert C.  
 Timoney, Gerald P.  
 Tinkham, John A.  
 Todd, Troy E.  
 Todd, William E.  
 Tollgaard, Elmer M.  
 Tregurtha, James D., Jr.  
 Trimble, Dan M.  
 Trotter, Robert J.  
 Truitt, Thomas D.  
 Trzcinski, Edward K.  
 Tuomela, Clyde H.  
 Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.  
 Twite, Martin J., Jr.  
 Tyson, James J., Jr.  
 Ullman, Charles D.  
 Underwood, Leland J.  
 Van Kirk, Robert W., Jr.  
 Van Kleeck, Justin L.  
 Vaughn, Robert E.  
 Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.  
 Villanueva, Xavier V.  
 Vines, Thomas E.  
 Vining, Adrian D.  
 Vinsel, John E.  
 Vogel, John J.  
 Vollmer, Robert J.  
 Vosseller, James B.  
 Wagner, Eugene R.  
 Wagner, Robert H.  
 Wallace, David T.  
 Wallace, Donald E.  
 Wallace, Kenneth R.  
 Waller, Alexander E., Jr.  
 Wamsley, John A.  
 Ward, Donald S.  
 Warner, Brooks F.  
 Warwick, William B.  
 Washington, Max L.  
 Weatherly, Robert T., Jr.  
 Weeks, Grady A.  
 Wegener, Glenn L.  
 Werner, Robert V.  
 Weymouth, Burton R.  
 Whaley, William S.  
 White, Arthur C.  
 White, John F., Jr.  
 White, John E.
- White, Robert J.  
 Whitehead, Richard T.  
 Whitley, Walter J.  
 Whitman, Donald L.  
 Whitmire, Vivien C.  
 Whittle, William B.  
 Wikeen, Donald B.  
 Wilbur, Harley D.  
 Wilgus, Carlton L.  
 Wilkes, Gilbert, 3d  
 Wilkins, James R., Jr.  
 Willard, Daniel D. M.  
 Wille, James E.  
 Willi, Thomas A.  
 Williams, Stanwix M.  
 Williams, William A., III  
 Willingham, William E., Jr.  
 Wilson, Donald R.  
 Wilson, James I.  
 Wilson, William W.  
 Wiram, Gordon H.  
 Wise, Gerald W.  
 Wise, Robert E.  
 Wiseman, Richard F.
- Wisenbaker, Eugene M.  
 Wood, John W.  
 Wood, Peter W.  
 Wooddell, Allen C.  
 Wooden, Neal R.  
 Woodman, Gordon P.  
 Woodruff, Richard F.  
 Woolcock, Thomas E.  
 Woodridge, Edmund T., Jr.  
 Wooley, Robert T.  
 Worchesek, Robert R.  
 Wright, Merritt B.  
 Wright, William B.  
 Wuethrich, Don L.  
 Wunderlich, Robert  
 Wylie, Henry K.  
 Young, Casanave H., Jr.  
 Yowell, Grover M.  
 Ziegler, Frank G.  
 Zimm, Alfonz  
 Zimmerly, Arthur, III  
 Zink, Stewart T.  
 Zwolinski, Frank J.

## MEDICAL CORPS

Foster, Donald J.  
 Good, Daniel C.  
 Kane, John R.  
 Osgood, Morgan F.

## SUPPLY CORPS

Armstrong, George K.  
 Barber, Ray C.  
 Bauer, Robert F.  
 Beatty, Carl N.  
 Bozewicz, John E.  
 Carpenter, Norman E.  
 Chandler, Hugh H.  
 Colen, Paul  
 Crain, Cassel O.  
 Crook, Clifford L., Jr.  
 Crowley, Charles W.  
 Curley, Wilfred B.  
 Davis, James B.  
 Dewey, Wayne D.  
 Donley, Harold C., Jr.  
 Dughi, Carl M.  
 Dunham, Donald J., Jr.  
 Ely, William B., Jr.  
 Emery, William T.  
 Francis, Evans J.  
 Fussell, Theodore J.  
 Geiger, Merrill A.  
 Gordon, Gilbert H., Jr.  
 Graham, Robert B.  
 Greenberg, Edwin G.  
 Gunn, Raymond G.  
 Halperin, George B.  
 Hauck, Richard H.  
 Henderson, John M.  
 Hoggard, William D., 2d  
 Johnson, Ernie F.  
 Jones, Burton H.  
 Katz, Samuel  
 Killebrew, Thomas E.  
 Lynn, James W.  
 Mason, Philip J.  
 Mayo, Joseph A., Jr.  
 McNabb, Thomas R.  
 Morris, Edwards M.  
 Morrison, Walton M.  
 Mulligan, Thomas J., Jr.  
 O'Neil, Harold P.  
 Paul, Charles B. III  
 Peloquin, Ferdinand C.  
 Pravit, William H.  
 Richardson, Mortimer J.  
 Ringhausen, Robert L.  
 Rippert, Donald J.  
 Roberts, Gerald E.  
 Robison, Gerald M.  
 Rolan, Loveman F.  
 Rudzinski, Anthony W.  
 Slemmons, Earl G., Jr.  
 Smith, Charles W.  
 Sterner, Francis J.  
 Stubbs, Raymond C.  
 Tvelta, Reynold C.  
 Van, George E.  
 Vroman, William G.  
 Webb, Davis L.

## CHAPLAIN CORPS

Boyd, George T.  
 Canfield, Robert A.  
 Doermann, Martin J.  
 Doverspike, Dale E.  
 Eaton, Hal H.  
 Frank, Joseph A.  
 Hammond, Edward P.  
 Hawkins, Thomas G.  
 Hitchens, Walter C.  
 Ivers, Victor J.  
 Jones, William L., Jr.  
 Kingsley, Donald F., Jr.  
 LeMaster, Donald C.  
 Leonard, Guy M., Jr.

Moore, Withers M.  
 Morris, Bernard N.  
 Nelson, Everett B.  
 Otto, Albert J.  
 Reid, Herbert L.  
 Richardson, Edward L.  
 Salter, Dempsey G.  
 Schultz, Theodore E.  
 Smith, Robert W.  
 Smith, William G., Jr.  
 Solomon, Charles W.  
 Thompson, Harrison R.  
 Wartes, Arthur J.  
 Zeller, Kenneth P.

## CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Richard E.  
 Austin, Bruce G.  
 Davis, Walter E., Jr.  
 Forehand, Paul W.  
 Gillespie, Albert C.  
 Huffman, James I.  
 Jones, Robert L.  
 Lee, Robert S., Jr.  
 Phelps, Pharo A.  
 Sherman, George E.  
 Stetson, John B.  
 Wagner, Walter R.  
 Whipple, Caryll R.

## DENTAL CORPS

Baxter, Gordon P.  
Janus, John T.  
Lyons, James J.

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Dwight J.  
Barkley, Lucien E.  
Beam, Walter E., Jr.  
Bergquist, Melvin D.  
Biggs, Leland M.  
Bobek, Francis R.  
Boggs, Clifford W.  
Boone, George A.  
Bowe, Warren G.  
Brouillette, Joseph H.  
Brown, Albert E.  
Bryant, Harvey F.  
Carr, Charles A., Jr.  
Conrad, Ray W.  
Courtney, John C.  
Daigle, Joseph E. N.  
Dailey, William M.  
Dempewolf, Eugene H.  
Denningham, John S.  
Devins, Thomas A.  
Dewitt, Richard G.  
Dinwiddie, Carl F.  
Douglas, George P.  
Duffey, William S.  
Elsasser, Edward J.  
Freeman, Noel L.  
Gay, Laverne W.  
Gehring, Jack H.  
Gellman, Martin  
Gibbons, Harry C., Jr.  
Goodrich, Neil E., Jr.  
Green, Barney O.  
Grossnickle, Paul "D."  
Hanavan, Robert J.  
Harvey, Dallas C.  
Hosler, Garwin M.  
Huber, Godfrey S.  
Jones, William H.  
Kaufman, Louis R.  
Kelly, Daniel L.  
Kelly, James D.  
Koepke, Milton E.  
Kramer, Ernest S.  
Lacy, Dexter J.  
Laedtke, Ralph H.  
Leach, Thomas G. Jr.

## NURSE CORPS

Anderson, June L.  
Barber, Mary E.  
Barron, Joan L.  
Black, Helen J.  
Bower, Joan E.  
Buckingham, Louise  
Carpenter, Lois T.  
Clemens, Rose M.  
Cooper, Opal J.  
Craig, Florence V.  
Crowe, Patricia P.  
Dennis, Catherine E.  
Dial, Thelma P.  
Easter, Mary R.  
Eberhardt, Marie  
Eldridge, Ruth E.  
Elliott, Laura S.  
Fitz, Barbara O.  
Fuller, Doris T.  
Gasper, Pearl Y.  
Greer, Goldie D.  
Harrigan, Nancy L.  
Hedrick, Betty S.  
Henkel, Dolores A.  
Herbert, Dellabelle  
Jaeger, Elizabeth L.  
Kallan, Addie E.  
Kirsch, Rose A.  
Leutz, Lillian D.  
Levin, Mildred R.  
Lewis, Margaret "R."  
Maguire, Frances P.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

## LINE

Acosta, William  
Adams, Henry R.  
Aiello, Carmine P.  
Allen, Donald L.  
Ambrose, John E.  
Amiot, Archie S.  
Andrus, Paul G.  
Annen, Martin  
Armstrong, Robert H.  
Arntzen, Arnt N.  
Aumack, Robert F.  
Baarstad, David E.  
Banke, Elmer A.  
Barlow, Cecil G.  
Barlow, Owen G.  
Barth, Ralph F.  
Bassett, Edward W.  
Bateman, William W.  
Bates, Howard U., Jr.  
Baum, Robert W.  
Baumhover, Denis A.  
Beaudry, Richard E.  
Beck, Emil F.  
Beesley, Howard L.  
Bell, Ronald W.  
Bennett, Roland K.  
Benner, Patrick H.  
Benson, Harry L.  
Benson, Melvin A.  
Bent, Robert G.  
Berger, James E.  
Berthier, Neil E.  
Bevington, Mearl L.  
Birdwell, James E., Jr.  
Birkenstock, Arthur  
Biro, William E.  
Bjornson, Carroll N.  
Blackington, Robert  
Block, Martin M.  
Blodgett, Dwight R.  
Blowers, Paul L.  
Boeing, Charles E.  
Bonney, Donald R.  
Bormann, Robert H.  
Bortner, James A.  
Boshard, Merrill L.  
Bowen, Robert S.  
Bowes, Charles L., Jr.  
Bowley, James C.  
Bowyer, Bobby O.  
Boyce, William R.  
Boyer, John C.  
Braddy, Don L., Jr.  
Bradfield, James  
Brandenburg, Robert  
Brand, Alvin  
Brawner, Harry C.  
Brecheisen, Samuel  
Brennan, Richard E.  
Brewer, Thomas J.  
Bristol, William H.  
Brown, Noel A., Jr.  
Brown, Alfred  
Brownley, Robert H.  
Brubaker, Edwin A.  
Brubaker, Walter Y.  
Brusso, Robert L.  
Bub, Laurence M., Jr.  
Bulloch, MacGregor  
Burnett, Thomas C.  
Burney, James G.  
Burrell, John T.  
Butler, Richard C.  
Cahill, Dan P.  
Campbell, William D.  
Cannon, Arthur J., Jr.  
Carey, David W., Jr.  
Carney, Stuart P., Jr.  
Carr, Robert L.  
Carroll, Norman L.  
Carrol, Eugene R.  
Casey, Harry J., Jr.

Cashman, Michael R., Jr.  
Cass, Sheldon V.  
Cauley, Gordon A., Jr.  
Cawley, Thomas J.  
Chalmers, Harold, Jr.  
Chamberlain, George A.  
Christensen, Charley S., Jr.  
Clark, William A.  
Clark, Douglas B.  
Clarke, Charles R.  
Cleland, William L.  
Coats, Lloyd F.  
Coburn, Theodore J.  
Cochran, Edward D.  
Cocker, Neil W.  
Coffman, Walter W.  
Connolly, Robert D.  
Connors, Daniel J.  
Conway, Thomas J.  
Conway, James J., Jr.  
Cook, Frederick D.  
Cormier, Warren G.  
Cotton, Alfred E.  
Covill, Clarence T.  
Craven, Alexander T.  
Cribbins, Paul D.  
Crosby, Richard D., Jr.  
Cross, Charles W.  
Culbertson, Richard K.  
Cumbie, Lorendo A.  
Cyr, Charles W., Jr.  
Dalla Betta, Aldo  
Dalrymple, Stanley M.  
Daly, Norman F.  
Danahy, James E.  
Dangler, Edward  
Davis, Richard E.  
Day, Putnam R.  
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.  
Dennis, Jamie  
Denton, John R.  
Dirienzo, Antonio C. V.  
Dobelstein, Robert E.  
Donovan, Robert S.  
Dougan, Richard A.  
Douglas, John M.  
Doyle, Thomas E.  
Dryfoose, Earl D., Jr.  
Dubois, Aldege, N. J.  
DuBon, Frederic V., Jr.  
Dudley, Robert A.  
Duffy, Lawson W.  
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.  
Duncan, Lewis R. W., Jr.  
Duncan, Richard D.  
Dunham, Neville D.  
Dutcher, Lester A.  
Dye, Bertie C.  
Eden, John W.  
Egga, John P.  
Eggen, Robert F.  
Ehnes, Walter P.  
Elias, Richard H.  
Ellison, LeRoy S.  
Ellis, William H.  
Ellis, Elbert J.  
Enright, Marc E.  
Farozic, Vincent  
Fasold, Karl J. R.  
Fechner, Ervin L.  
Feifert, Alvin H.  
Fenner, Richard C.  
Ferer, Harvey  
Ferretti, John P.  
Finch, David L.  
Fleming, William T.  
Floyd, James B.  
Flynn, Donald J.  
Ford, Paul T.  
Freytag, David R.  
Frodigh, Robert C.  
Fry, Orris J., Jr.

Gaddis, George E.  
Gaddy, James K.  
Gamache, Samuel C.  
Gardner, Clyde W.  
Garner, Mirron W.  
Giffen, Kevin  
Gilmartin, Bernard F.  
Gimbroni, Donald O.  
Glocke, Frederick B.  
Goins, Charles W.  
Goldstein, Richard K.  
Goodale, James E.  
Gordon, Lawrence C.  
Gorman, Russell W.  
Graham, Thomas G.  
Gregg, Robert S.  
Grenfell, John E.  
Groff, Bruce F.  
Guggenbiller, James A.  
Guill, James H.  
Hack, Alfred G.  
Hale, George D.  
Hall, Berkeley W.  
Halle, James E.  
Hamann, Donald C.  
Hamburg, James E.  
Hamlin, Daniel A.  
Hammett, Bernard J.  
Hampton, Charles T.  
Hana, Donald O.  
Handzel, Joseph L.  
Hanson, Perry W.  
Harding, Price P., Jr.  
Hargis, Robert F.  
Haro, Hilario L.  
Harriman, Earl L.  
Harris, Vance L.  
Hart, Richard S.  
Hartzell, Robert H.  
Haugner, Raymond C.  
Hausser, Warren M.  
Heidkamp, Francis G.  
Herbst, John M.  
Hertzberg, Robert H.  
Hess, Robert L.  
Hickman, Charles I.  
Hickman, Ronald S.  
Hirschey, Arthur A.  
Hitch, Lyman B.  
Hocking, Arnold T.  
Hodge, William J.  
Hoffa, Franklin H.  
Hoffmann, William  
Hoffmeyer, John T.  
Hofmeister, Howard F.  
Hospodar, Robert S.  
Howard, Donald H.  
Howlett, Eugene F., Jr.  
Hoy, Hugh J.  
Hubbard, James E.  
Hudspeth, Jake W.  
Hughes, John A.  
Hunter, Paul I.  
Hurd, Richard N.  
Hurley, John R.  
Husmann, Jack H.  
Hyler, Robert E.  
Iredale, John P.  
Irwin, Martin W.  
Isherwood, Robert S.  
Ivarson, Leonard M.  
Jacobsen, Adolf M. B.  
Jarboe, Robert W.  
Jensen, Donald L.  
Johnson, John F.  
Johnson, Joseph H.  
Johnson, Paul G.  
Jones, Floyd T., Jr.  
Kagey, Leslie O., Jr.  
Kaiser, Herbert J.  
Kaiser, Richard  
Kallgren, Bruce M.  
Kallsen, Leslie W.  
Kampe, John H.  
Kamrad, Joseph G.  
Kandel, Philip J.  
Karsten, Herbert G.

Keefe, Donald J.  
Keil, Donald E.  
Keller, Robert T.  
Kern, David E.  
Kiefer, Emil L.  
Kilmarx, Robert D.  
King, Edwin M.  
Klages, William M.  
Klippstein, John R.  
Kluga, Norbert R.  
Knowles, Robert C.  
Kohler, Elmer C.  
Kopec, Edward  
Kowalsky, Bradley D.  
Kramer, Stanley D.  
Krass, John C.  
Kroc, Richard A.  
Kusulos, Harold A.  
Kutschara, Edwin A.  
Lancaster, Samuel B., Jr.  
Langston, William D.  
Lanier, James S., II  
Lassen, William V.  
Leary, Ramon W.  
Leavitt, William  
Lee, Calvin H.  
Lee, George E.  
Lee, LaVern G.  
Lennard, Russel R.  
Leonhardt, Robert J.  
LeTourneau, Paul J.  
Lindemann, Charles T., Jr.  
Lindenbaum, Herbert J.  
Lindsay, Malcolm, Jr.  
Linkenhoker, William "W."  
Lion, William D.  
Loudin, Donald J.  
Lurcott, Charles W.  
Lyman, Albie A., Jr.  
Lyne, George C.  
Lyons, Robert K.  
Lyons, Carl P.  
Maasbyll, Arthur R.  
MacDowell, Charles R.  
MacLeod, Richard G.  
Mahan, Frank H.  
Maher, James J., Jr.  
Malandar, Vernon C.  
Mallonee, Jack L.  
Malone, Duane E.  
Maloney, Joseph F.  
Manderlioli, Fred A.  
Manderson, Marion C.  
Mandle, Stephen I. P.  
Manscalco, Philip M., Jr.  
Marriner, Richard E.  
Martin, Raymond D.  
Martin, James R.  
Mathews, Ross A., Jr.  
Matson, James C.  
Matthews, William E., III  
May, Robert L.  
May, Warren R.  
Mayer, Matthew L.  
McCarty, James R., Jr.  
McCoy, Thomas H.  
McCulley, Wilson, Jr.  
McGlone, Richard J.  
McGrath, Daniel P.  
McKay, John B.  
McLeod, William L.  
McLoughlin, Howard T.  
McMinn, Earl C.  
McMurray, John W.  
McNabb, Joseph M.  
McNaughton, Alan  
McNeill, Leo J.  
McPherson, Corwin R.  
Meadows, Robert  
Meckoll, Robert F.  
Megquier, Norman L.  
Melidosian, Sahag C.



Merkley, Clarence W. Rivard, Earl J.  
Merton, Harry L., Jr. Rohrbach, Robert L.  
Mesh, Stanley J. Roland, John J.  
Messersmith, John D., Rolles, David H.  
Jr. Rooney, Richard W.  
Metz, Robert E. Rooney, Peter W.  
Meyer, Paul A. Rose, Raymond C.  
Meyers, Richard E. Rosenberg, Donald D.  
Milani, Albert V. Roulstone, Lawrence  
Milem, Philip L. M.  
Miller, Robert D. Rowan, Robert D.  
Minkinen, Erkki O. Rowlands, David M.  
Mitchell, Duane G. Rubey, Ervin B., Jr.  
Molzan, Edward W. Rubinstein, Alvin Z.  
Montgomery, Loren N. Ruch, Roger E.  
Moore, John F., Jr. Ruggiero, Michael E.  
Moore, Sidney R., Jr. Rush, George H., Jr.  
Moore, Ronald A. Russ, Joseph A., Jr.  
Moore, Robert A. Russell, Peter A.  
Mooris, John W. Ryan, Edward S.  
Mortimer, Edward P. Sallen, Roy P.  
Mosher, William F. Salzarulo, Daniel  
Mouradian, Michael Sampsel, Alan V.  
Mueller, Richard L. Samson, Edward L.,  
Mulken, Martin J. Jr.  
Mulvihill, Robert J. Sandsberry, Jack C.  
Mushyn, Thomas F., Schaffer, Alfred J.  
Jr. Schleif, Edward H.  
Myers, Clifton D. Schneeberg, Delvine  
Myrick, Bishop M. C.  
Nagengast, Philip J. Schneider, Arthur F.  
Nalley, William M. Scholl, Kenneth C.  
Naumchik, Alec Schreuder, Joseph A.  
Nelid, Arthur W. Schroeder, Robert A.  
Neitz, John J. Schultheis, Lawrence  
Nelsen, Norman W. W.  
Nitsche, Paul D. Schurman, John R.  
Noland, Harry M., Jr. Schwartz, Bernard  
Nylander, Arthur G. Schwartz, Burtell W.  
O'Brien, Charles J., Scott, Melvin L.  
Jr. Scully, Donald G.  
Oliver, Howard W. Seaver, Richard W.  
Olsen, George W. Seawell, Lloyd M.  
O'Regan, Edward See, Elliot M., Jr.  
Ortiz, Julian E. Self, William H. C.  
Overbey, Frank E., Jr. Serini, Domenick N.  
Page, Daniel G. Shanks, Donald G.  
Palmer, Prosser W. Shinn, Roy E., Jr.  
Papin, Franklin E. Shonka, Harold G.  
Parent, Gerald J. Siebert, Andrew J.  
Parks, James A. Simonet, John T.  
Patterson, Donald W. Simone, Joseph R.  
Pavelle, James R. Simpson, Louis M.  
Pepon, John M. Sisley, James R.  
Perkins, Albert E. Skirm, George L., Jr.  
Perrochet, George M. Smith, Richard B.  
Perry, Joseph M. Smith, Maurice E.  
Peters, Ralph C., Jr. Smith, Bryan M., Jr.  
Petersen, Donald E. Smith, Joseph C.  
Pfum, Frederick W. Smith, Henry J. B.  
Philbrick, Alfred R., Smith, Merl  
Jr. Smith, Malcolm C.  
Phillips, Charles T. Sodersten, Charles M.  
Picht, Donald H. Sollecito, Peter  
Pietro, Joseph M. Sorensen, Vernon L.  
Pinzel, Lawrence E. Space, William E.  
Platzek, Eugene H. Spencer, Richard H.  
Pollard, Lyle H. Spengler, Lewis E.  
Posin, Jack Spicer, Hugh J.  
Pospisil, Albert C. Stanley, Henry M.  
Poulakis, William Starbecker, Eugene N.  
Powers, Joseph P. Stephenson, Robert  
Poyner, Raymond P. H.  
Pratt, William C. Stephens, Wayne L.  
Price, Richard A. Stevens, William T.  
Pritchard, Patrick L. Stewart, James W.  
Quinn, Jack Q. Stingl, Alfred L.  
Raffaelli, Gaston L. J. Stockly, Ayres H.  
Rajczl, Leslie J. Stokes, Glenn M.  
Rand, Joseph S. Stoklosa, Richard G.  
Rathbun, Wells A., Stollmeier, Harry A.  
Jr. Stone, Frederick G.  
Repovsch, Albert W. Storm, John S.  
Revenaugh, John J. Strand, John A., Jr.  
Ribble, Richard S. Strebler, Cornel F.  
Rice, Liston M., Jr. Stubbs, Robert C.  
Rice, Merle A. Study, Kenneth L.  
Rich, Morris S. Sugarman, Samuel L.  
Rickey, Charles "S" Sulley, Thomas F.  
Rieber, George E., Jr. Summerlin, Kenneth  
Riggs, Frank D. L.

Summitt, Clyde W. Walker, George D.  
Swaim, Glen R. Wallach, Philip  
Swaim, Marvin W., Jr. Walter, Earl D.  
Swain, Frederick C. Warner, Charles E.  
Sweigart, Richard D. Wasniewski, Emil F.  
Swope, Ralph O. Watt, Alan D.  
Szmurlo, Thaddeus F. Watters, George D.  
Taborsky, George E. Webb, William H.  
Tadlock, Maurice H. Weiss, Paul A.  
Taubman, Jerome Welser, Henry A.  
Tebbo, Ballard W. Wessman, Robert A.  
Templeton, Kenneth Westervelt, Henry G.  
L. Westergren, David P.  
Teplow, Theodore H. Whiteleather, Charles  
Thorndike, Robert F. H., Jr.  
Tiratto, Joseph White, Wendell A.  
Tobey, Richard S. White, James S.  
Tobias, David L. Wiegand, Victor H.  
Tolford, Charles L., Wilbur, Edward T.  
Jr. Wild, Robert W.  
Toomey, Bernard C. Wilder, Fred W.  
Toy, Frank E. Wilkey, Roscoe S., II  
Traynor, Lawrence E. Wilkinson, James D.  
Tricco, Gilbert H. Williams, Leland S.  
Trindade, Rogerio Williams, John A.  
Tynan, Robert J. Wilson, Marvin J.  
Ulman, Adran C. Wilson, Richard A.  
Vacca, Diamante D. Wilson, Frank M., Jr.  
Vanderbeck, Eugene Wilson, Alexander B.  
A. Wilson, Robert H.  
VanDomelen, Peter, Winger, Paul J.  
III Winton, John R., Jr.  
VanLeuven, Alfred F. Wood, Richard D.  
Veasle, Robert H. Wood, Albert D.  
Vehorn, Dale A. Wood, Arthur F.  
Vehslage, Stanley D. Yanovitch, George A.  
Vlahos, Christopher Young, William P.,  
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr. Jr.  
Vollmert, Eugene C. Youngblood, James  
Wachowiak, Francis C., Jr.  
Walker, William R. Zuclich, Gustav C.

## MEDICAL CORPS

Abell, Thomas G. Blanton, Frank S., Jr.  
Aimenoff, Irwin A. Blau, David  
Akin, George M., Jr. Bloner, Emanuel M.  
Alderman, George C. Blum, Harold P.  
Alexander, George L., Bolanovich, Lester J.  
Jr. Bonney, James H.  
Allen, Robert G. Borrelli, Raphael F.,  
Allen, Richard L. Jr.  
Altschuler, Kenneth Boudreau, Robert F.  
Z. Bowen, Reginald S.  
Amsden, Neal F. Bowlm, Paul F.  
Anderson, Lewis D. Bozer, John M.  
Anderson, Richard R. Brandon, Leonard H.  
Aquadro, Charles F. Brandt, Henry E.  
Arbona-Figueroa, Jose A. Bratman, Robert L.  
Arthur, Basil C. Braunstein, Edgar G.  
Ashworth, Charles R. Brennan, Thomas V.  
Auerbach, Arthur H. Bridge, Robert E.  
Avent, James K., Jr. Brink, Paul E.  
Bahnsen, William F. Brinsley, Bertram  
Bahr, Donald E. Brod, James J.  
Bailey, Norman W. Brodie, Sheldon "J"  
Baird, William H. Brody, Arthur  
Baker, Larry D. Brown, Dudley E., Jr.  
Balin, Howard Brown, Jacob V.  
Barnes, John C. Brown, Philip W., Jr.  
Barnette, Ortha J. Bugg, Charles P.  
Barrett, John J. Burke, Robert A.  
Barrick, Richard H. Burke, Albert V.  
Bauer, Clifford T. Burman, Don "M"  
Bean, George W. Burris, Boyd L.  
Becker, Bruce A. Butler, Milton C., Jr.  
Beckwith, Frederick Byrd, William M.  
D. Byrum, Graham V.  
Beehler, Ernest W., Cady, Gerald W.  
Jr. Candels, Lothar R.  
Behrman, Jack Cannon, Joseph N., Jr.  
Bell, George R. Carpenter, Harry M.  
Bennett, Wayne E. Carson, William E.  
Benton, Owen D. Carter, Donald L.  
Beres, Joseph A. Carter, Henry S.  
Berk, James L. Casebolt, Donald E.  
Berman, Irwin Cather, Carl H., Jr.  
Bernhard, Robert, Jr. Cauffman, William J.  
Bialock, Robert W. Cheers, William C., Jr.  
Christiansen, Kjeil H.  
Cicalese, Gerard T.

Cline, Thomas J. Getzen, Lindsay C.  
Cole, Buell C. Giannelli, Stanley, Jr.  
Collins, James E. Giles, Ben J.  
Constable, John D. Giotzer, Donald J.  
Copeland, Sam "P", Jr. Godley, Milton L.  
Corso, Philip F. Goetz, Henry E.  
Corson, Hampton P. Goldhirsch, Henry  
Corwin, Leonard J. Goldstein, Marcy A.  
Cox, James L. D. Goodwin, Robert  
Cox, John W. Gordon, Robert B.  
Crisp, George O., Jr. Graff, Shirl R.  
Critzler, Ben L. Green, Leo R.  
Crook, Angus M. G. Greenberg, Joseph  
Crum, Robert B. Greenberg, Wayne V.  
Dalrymple, Richard E. Griffin, Edwin D.  
Darden, John S. Grote, Arthur J.  
Dardis, Alfred R. Grubbs, Thomas A.,  
Davis, Richard G. Jr.  
Day, Francis T. Guderian, Arnold M.  
Deach, Robert A. Gussack, Harold A.  
Dearani, Abraham C. Gussler, Charles G.  
DeLave, Daniel P. Guthrie, Andrew D.,  
Delgado, Delio D. Jr.  
DeMeo, Daniel R. Hadley, David M.  
Dexheimer, Frank R. Hall, Louis A.  
Dickerman, Herbert Hall, William M.  
W. Hamilton, Carroll S.  
Dobel, Gerald F. Hamilton, Frank A.,  
Dole, Kenneth V. Jr.  
Doloff, Leonard Hardey, Carlton E.  
Donaldson, Robert M. Harm, John P.  
Jr. Harris, James G.  
Dooley, Thomas A., III Hart, George R.  
Dooley, Michael B. Hartman, John M.  
Draheim, Jerry W. Hassan, Kamel J.  
Dudley, Hugh R. Hay, Gene R.  
DuLaney, Charles H. Heaton, Elton, Jr.  
Dunlap, James A., Jr. Helgren, Donald G.  
Dunn, Thomas S., Jr. Hemness, Edwin M.  
Eagan, John T. Hensold, William F.  
Easterday, Robert H. Herring, William B.  
Eastwood, Robert A. Hicks, Jesse R.  
Eckert, Herbert L. Hill, William N., Jr.  
Edmunds, Meade C., Hinton, Benjamin F.  
Jr. Hnilo, Joseph M.  
Edwards, Sears E. Hochman, Richard I.  
Edwards, Ernest G. Hoerner, Oscar G.  
Efron, Robert Hofmann, Walter D.  
Egbert, Lawrence D. Hoover, Robert T.  
Jr. Horner, Robert L.  
Ehlers, Charles W., III Howren, Harry H., Jr.  
Ehrlich, George E. Huffer, John C.  
Ehrlich, Edward N. Huffman, Thomas A.  
Elam, William N., Jr. Huggins, Charles E.  
Elesh, Fred S. Hurley, Lloyd A.  
Elgin, Lee W., Jr. Hutchins, Vince L.  
Ellasoph, Ira I. Hyman, William  
Emery, Walter C. Irons, Raymond J.  
Eney, Irving P. Jacob, James A., Jr.  
Epple, Kenneth H. Jamison, Harwin B.  
Epple, Lawrence K. Jamison, William A.  
Eskelson, David W. Jauchler, Gerard W.  
Evans, Frederic M. Johnson, Arthur J.  
Ewing, Channing L. Johnson, John D.  
Fabricius, Richard N. Johnson, Louis L.  
Fadul, Armand Jones, John R.  
Feenstra, Laurence Jones, Reinold J.  
"H" Josel, Mark S.  
Feigelman, Howard F. Josey, John S.  
Felton, Lester M., Jr. Judge, Walter F.  
Fennel, Peter "J" Jumonville, Alcee J.  
Flier, Eugene M. Justiniano-Diaz, Raul  
Fitchett, Vernon H. T.  
Flanagan, William L. Kaplan, Meyer  
Fletcher, William P. Karr, Samuel L.  
Fogelman, Henry Katims, Robert B.  
Folmsbee, Glenn A. Kelli, Stuart L.  
Fortenberry, Jerry "A" Kelleher, Robert E.  
Foster, James B. T. Kelley, Thomas J., Jr.  
Fote, Francis A. Kemp, Verbon E., Jr.  
Fowler, Robert R. Kenley, James B.  
Freeman, Gordon R. Kenlon, Andrew M.  
Freeman, William T. Keyes, George W.  
Friedberg, Samuel J. Khairallah, Philip A.  
Fry, William J. Kilgore, James M., Jr.  
Fuchs, Paul D. Killeen, Raymond N.  
Garrison, Joseph S., F.  
III Kinder, Eugene J.  
Gebhart, William F. Kindler, Jack  
Gerber, Edward King, Philip J.  
Gerety, Robert P. King, Lawrence M.,  
Jr.

Kingsolver, Wendell R. Ornitz, Edward M.  
Kirk, Robert F. Ostlund, Philip D.  
Kleh, Thomas R. Ottum, John A.  
Koeff, Steve T. Oudenhoven, Richard C.  
Koloski, Martin G. Ovington, Robert C.  
Koth, Douglas R. Owsley, John Q., Jr.  
Koury, Thomas L. Packert, Richard C.  
Krasner, Bernard Packer, James T.  
Kuczek, Edward P. Page, Benjamin S.  
Kulp, Robert L. Paladino, Joseph A.  
Kurlicek, Peter, Jr. Park, Lee C.  
Labitzke, Hermann G. Pawlowski, Joseph M.  
Lance, Kendrick P. Pearse, Jack H.  
Lanni, John P. Pennisi, Joseph A.  
Lavell, Thomas E., Jr. Perot, Phanor L., Jr.  
Lebovitz, Jerome J. Perry, John F.  
Ledwith, James W. Phillips, John R.  
Leenhouts, Kenneth C. Pierce, Chester M.  
Lefer, Leon Pierce, John R.  
Leibow, Sheldon G. Pinto, Peter S.  
Lensgraf, Donald D. Piper, Charles E., Jr.  
Lesslie, Peter B. Pomponio, Joseph G.  
Leventhal, Harvey R. Posey, Edward W.  
Levy, Marshall S. Postle, Jack R.  
Lewis, Lawrence J. Potter, Clinton B.  
Libo, Hershel W. Prather, Victor A., Jr.  
Liebendorfer, Richard A. Prentice, Robert J.  
Linn, Bernard S. Proulx, Harvey J.  
Linz, Werner A. Quickert, Marvin H.  
Lister, Julius Rabinov, Keith R.  
Livingood, John K. Raffensperger, John G.  
Locke, Francis A. Rambo, Rawdon E.  
Lohnes, John H. Rando, Joseph J.  
Long, Henry H. Rasnussen, Peter  
Lorber, Mortimer Reagan, James L.  
Lowe, Kurt J. Reiser, Albert I.  
Luchi, Robert J. Reisser, John M., Jr.  
Luina-Diaz, Ramon R. Resto-Soto, Andres D.  
Lutterloh, Isaac H., Jr. Reynolds, Arthur M.  
MacLeod, Colin C. Reynolds, Hugh  
Magnan, Charles G. Richards, John B.  
Jr. Richards, Lynn S., Jr.  
Mammel, Clayton "K" Richardson, Joseph H.  
Marcotte, Maurice G. Riley, Bennet J.  
Markee, Alan S. Ring, John J.  
Markovits, Andrew S. Ripple, Rudolph J., Jr.  
Martin, Sidney A. Rittenbury, Max S.  
Matsumoto, Kenneth D. Roberts, Arthur R.  
Mattson, Daniel H. Rodgers, Theodore Y.  
Mauch, Eugene W. Ross, Warren H.  
Mayberry, William E. Roth, Dover  
Mayle, Francis C., Jr. Rothenberg, Herbert  
McGee, Lawrence S. Rothrock, Irvin A.  
Jr. Royce, Paul C.  
McGhee, John M. Rundell, Frank L.  
McHenry, Laudie E. Russell, John M., Jr.  
Jr. Sacrinity, Nicholas W.  
McLean, George E. Sager, Stanley M.  
McMahan, Robert O. Saville, John W.  
McMahon, Donald, Jr. Savitt, Allen J.  
McNeely, Irwin H. Schlip, Arthur O.  
McPherson, Glen E. Schilling, Richard J.  
Medic, Walter T. Schmitt, James N.  
Mehan, Donald J. Schmitz, Gerhard W.  
Mellette, Russell R. Schneider, Richard H.  
Mendelsohn, Ronald E. Schneider, Stanley H.  
Meredith, Charles E. Schoeffel, Michael E.  
Metcalfe, John W., Jr. Schreier, Arthur J.  
Mishkin, Mark M. Schulman, David  
Moersch, Richard N. Schwartz, Julius L.  
Monroe, Kenneth E. Schwartz, Lester  
Moss, Allan T. Scott, George E.  
Moya, Frank Sears, Peter D.  
Mushovic, James Sencindiver, Paige V.  
Myers, James D. Shafran, Morton E.  
Nellermoe, Carol W. Shea, Martin C., Jr.  
Nelson, Raymond M. Sheffield, Donald J., Sr.  
Nemerovski, Sheldon A. Sheldon, Gerard P.  
Jr. Sherman, Marion M.  
Nirschl, Boyd F. Shrago, Earl S. P.  
Nix, Thomas E., Jr. Shutt, John P.  
Noonan, Frank J. Sifford, Richard L.  
Nora, Paul F. Silva, Thomas F., Jr.  
Nowell, Peter C. Silver, Stuart R.  
Nunnery, Arthur W. Simmons, Ernest C.  
O'Connell, Fred H. Singer, Herbert I.  
Odell, Gerard B.

Singleton, Samuel W. Tessler, Arthur N.  
Sinnott, Edward C. Teynor, Joseph W.  
Slager, Richard F. Thompson, Arthur F.  
Slater, John B. Thompson, Joseph M.  
Smathers, Charles R. Tobias, Gordon L.  
II Tobin, Arnold D.  
Smith, Asa J. Torsney, Jerome M.  
Smith, Jack G. Traubado, Lawrence E.  
Smith, James W. Trapnell, Richard H.  
Smith, Robert A. Trostle, Henry S.  
Smith, Robert C. Turkalo, Jaroslav K.  
Smith, Wiley R., Jr. Tyrrell, Joseph J.  
Smythe, Lowell J. Veggeberg, Kermit R.  
Sode, Jonas Viger, Leopold A.  
Soderstrom, John F. Volkman, Alvin  
Solberg, Lincoln E. VonEssen, Carl F.  
Sowers, Clarence R. Waive, Henry J.  
Spratt, John S., Jr. Ward, Franklyn P.  
Standifer, John J. Ware, Robert E.  
Steele, Jack T. Warren, George W.  
Steg, Joseph Weeth, John B.  
Steller, Robert E. Weidner, William A.  
Stevens, Joseph H. Weiner, David B.  
Stern, Charles Weis, Donald R.  
Stevens, Benjamin C. Westman, Jack C.  
Jr. Werman, Robert  
Stevenson, Andrew W. Westphal, Benjamin H.  
Jr. White, Bradford C.  
Stewart, Charles C. White, Jack C.  
Stewart, Edgar B. Wilkie, Ormond L.  
Stimets, Wendell A. Williamson, Russell G.  
Stohlman, John W. III Williams, Larry E.  
Stormont, James M. Willis, Harlan L.  
Strickler, James C. Wilson, Donald K.  
Sullivan, Martin R. Wilson, Frank L., Jr.  
Sullivan, Robert F. Wilson, John G.  
Suml, Walter T. Wingfield, Richard W.  
Syms, Charles A. Wolf, Robert L.  
Taggart, George W. Wolfson, Mast, II  
Tarride, Joseph, Jr. Wood, Loring W.  
Tartell, Paul Wurzel, John F.  
Taylor, Robert D. Yaffee, Howard S.  
Teel, Peter Yeagley, Heber E.  
Teel, Theodore T., Jr. Yopp, Lloyd G.  
Territo, Joseph J. Zehl, William F.

## SUPPLY CORPS

Acheson, Robert G. Kreissl, Leary B.  
Beam, Loudin J. Lennox, Grenes J.  
Bennett, Donald E. Lewis, Frederick W.  
Borbridge, George F. Liska, Mitchell C.  
Brinkley, William C. Neill, Julian F.  
Brown, Everett G. Pattison, Donald N.  
Brownell, William H. Raven, John F.  
Brunke, John F. Roth, Eugene E.  
Busse, Ralph E. Rothstein, Arnold J.  
Carmody, Barry S. Sappanos, Louis M.  
Crowley, Charles W. Schumacher, James T.  
DeVilbiss, Robert J. Snow, Joseph C.  
Fraley, Hugh K. Sumner, "H" "L", Jr.  
Goldfield, Herbert S. Tauer, Thomas J.  
Hamilton, Paul B. Willis, Robert G.  
Hudson, Richard S. Wise, William L.  
Kendrick, Thomas F., Jr. Wolter, Fred

## CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bosca, Joseph R. Martin, James B.  
Carnes, John H. McClain, Benjamin J.  
Casey, Vincent deP. McKnight, Peter G.  
Chrisman, Myron W. Newman, Thomas A., Jr.  
Cohill, John W. O'Connor, John J.  
Ernst, Elmer F. Pieper, Paul F. W.  
Garvens, Eugene A. Powell, James A.  
Gould, John D. Reid, James D.  
Heim, Robert L. Schroerluke, Henry P.  
Hill, Rodger F. Smith, Earl W.  
Kane, Dennis C. Stroman, Henry W.  
Kempson, Farrell W. Zimbelman, Charles R.  
Kenny, Thomas A.  
Koch, David C.

## CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Baton, Leo L. Emery, Byron M.  
Belcher, Philip G. Jungmans, Clifford A.  
Bourne, William A. Loomis, Raymond W.  
Clerc, Louis H. Taylor, Lewis B., Jr.  
Degnan, Henry W., Jr. Winkler, Robert L.

## DENTAL CORPS

Aaronian, James B. Anderson, Gordon D.  
Allan, Lamont D. Andrews, Jack W.  
Allbeck, Lester W. Antonieski, Eugene P.

Baahlmann, Ralph H. Gates, Richard H.  
Bacon, Stanley H. Gervason, Richard E.  
Badner, Jack Gilbert, Melvin L.  
Baker, Martin H. Glasser, Harold N.  
Barber, Herbert Glassman, Milton S.  
Beckmann, William J. Golan, Theodore P.  
Benet, Mark Goldstone, Stanley  
Benton, Robert H. Gordon, Jerome  
Bettis, Ray P. Gould, John C., Jr.  
Bicknell, Gordon H. Graham, Barney D.  
Bjerken, Maurice R. Gray, Paul H.  
Blackmon, William L. Gregory, William A.  
Jr. Grippio, John O.  
Black, Marion M., Jr. Grover, Alan J.  
Blagbrough, Richard Gugino, Carl F.  
W. Guichet, Niles F.  
Bohacek, Joseph R. Hall, Robert M.  
Boline, Charles A. Hansen, Richard P.  
Bork, Fred F. Harpine, John W., Jr.  
Bouquet, Jean-Pierre Harrison, Byron D.  
E. Harris, Joseph C.  
Boye, Kenneth Hartland, Thomas J.  
Bradley, Daniel M., Jr. Hartley, Bruce R.  
Brofsky, Herbert B. Hays, James W.  
Brokaw, Rodman Hazen, Stanley P.  
Brown, Donald S. Heath, Wayne L.  
Brown, Seymour L. Hebert, Jules J. D.  
Brownstein, Martin M. Hinkel, Erwin J., Jr.  
Brunson, Benjamin Hickey, David G.  
M. III Hill, Jay W.  
Bryan, William J. Hillebrand, Paul J.  
Buckley, Arthur B. Hodson, Charles G.  
Burkhard, Robert W. Hoen, Ralph D.  
Burns, Kurt D. Hollis, Robert H.  
Caldwell, Robert L. Hollingsworth, John H.  
Carroll, William J. Holtan, Phillip J.  
Carusillo, Louis J., Jr. Hooke, Will M.  
Chain, Robert R. Horton, Leland C.  
Cherry, Daniel V. Chianese, Thomas C.  
Chianese, Thomas C. Childress, James R.  
Childress, James R. Choissier, Frederick G.  
Choissier, Frederick G. Christenson, Robert E.  
Christenson, Robert E. Christie, Robert W.  
Jr. Jacobson, John D.  
Ciolino, Vincent P. Jacobson, Robert L.  
Clapp, Johnny R. Jaffe, Raymond P.  
Clippinger, Richard V. Javois, Alexander J.  
Cody, Donald J. Johnson, Thomas E.  
Cordes, Richard H. Johnson, George S., Jr.  
Cornish, Robert L. Jones, Bruce D.  
Cowen, Charles E., Jr. Kaep, Thomas J.  
Cox, Robert M., Jr. Kahn, Arthur M.  
Cromartie, Thieran A. Kaplan, Herman  
Cullom, Robert D. Kaufman, Jerome  
Curley, Philip W. Kellogg, Keith D.  
Daines, William F. Kelly, Joseph M.  
Damiano, Maurice A. Kelly, William F.  
Davis, Thomas G. Kessler, William B.  
Day, Lawrence D. Kiwatsky, Frank  
de Julien, Lorenz F. Kloefeler, Gale D.  
Jr. Knowles, Ralph E., Jr.  
Demaree, Neil C. Kronfeld, Gerald W.  
Deutsch, Thomas J. Kwait, Donald  
Devine, Robert K. Labriola, William H.  
Dickson, Floyd J. Lamer Mayer, Richard N.  
Dillard, Clarence E. Landgraf, John R.  
Jr. Lavelle, John J., Jr.  
Dodelson, Donald J. Laws, Robert K.  
Douglas, Dan E. Lawson, Edward M.  
Drake, Daniel H. Lawton, Edward A.  
Drechsel, Lewis W. Leidich, Ray N.  
Duca, Lawrence P. Leiser, Fred C., Jr.  
Dvorovy, Eugene S. Lesinski, Eugene F.  
Eaton, Emmett A. Lewandowski, Anthony  
Epstein, Norman A. Licht, Richard P.  
Ewen, Earl A. Liebster, Louis I.  
Fields, Ellis S. Lindenauer, Irving H.  
Fink, Herbert A. Loewenthal, Harold  
Flocca, Robert A. Lombardi, Ludwig A.  
Flocchi, Raymond M. Love, William "C"  
Fletcher, Leland M. Lozano, Carlos  
Foster, Glen E., Jr. Lucia, Ralph W.  
Freeburn, Harold E. Magnusson, Gordon K.  
Jr. Mahn, Ronald E.  
Freed, Sidney Markwood, James A.  
Friend, Max W., Jr. Marsh, Charles W.  
Fritsche, James Mason, Jack R.  
Gabriel, Thomas W. Matarazzo, Joseph T.  
Garbett, Harry N. McCauley, Robert B.  
Garman, Thomas A.



McClure, Thomas "A" Schroeder, Ralph C.  
McDevitt, Edwin R., Seamons, Dick C.  
Jr.  
McDonald, Richard L. Sepe, George J.  
McIntosh, Richard A. Sheffer, Edgar A.  
McWhorter, Howard B. Shepard, Leon A.  
Meka, Edward M. Silvestri, Joseph G.  
Mendel, Robert W. Jr.  
Mercer, Victor H. Simpson, Keith B.  
Michels, Gerald L. Sims, William P.  
Miller, David L. Smith, Donald C.  
Millians, Frank A., Jr. Smith, George E., Jr.  
Minker, Jules S. Smith, John P.  
Mitchell, Earl L., Jr. Smith, James O.  
Mitchell, Howard C. Sonos, John R.  
Jr.  
Moll, Robert K. Sorokin, Raymond L.  
Montgomery, Wendel Sower, John B.  
E. Starosta, Norman M.  
Moore, Frank B. Steinberg, Alvin L., Jr.  
Moore, Robert L. Stein, Howard N.  
Moore, Robert L., Jr. Stetzel, Robert "M"  
Murray, James N. Stier, Joseph B.  
Nagelsen, Joseph C. Stoltz, David R.  
Jr. Story, Gordon H.  
Nagourney, Frank E. Sullivan, Charles R.  
Needle, Robert N. Sweet, Thomas O.  
Nelson, Donald W. Swimmer, Leonard  
Nied, Walter S., Jr. Tanner, Thomas P.  
Nolf, Robert S. Taylor, George J.  
Norton, James A. Taylor, Ray P.  
Oenbrink, Philip G. Taylor, Albert J.  
Olswang, Kay B. Taylor, William N.  
Pace, Madison S. Tertel, Kenneth J.  
Page, Charles L., Jr. Tesch, Robert  
Painter, Everett G. Thomasson, Howard  
Perrodin, John A. K., Jr.  
Peterson, Abraham F., Thomas, Julian J., Jr.  
Pfeifer, John S. Thomas, Benjamin  
Phillippi, John W. "L"  
Picard, Jean A. Thompson, Robert G.  
Pike, John S. Thompson, James C.  
Pinter, James E. Tow, Herman D., Jr.  
Pomije, Earle F. Trent, Calvert E.  
Post, Roger A. Tylicki, John F.  
Powell, Kershaw E. Valentine, Rodney F.  
Prah, Jerome H. VonBerg, Donald R.  
Rappaport, Albert Wall, Joseph R. P., Jr.  
Rashkind, Herbert E. Walters, Percy F.  
Razor, Richard D. Watson, Henry S.  
Ratliffe, James R. Weaver, Charles L.  
Rathburn, Marion Webb, John J.  
Ray, Charles E. Weinberg, Lawrence  
Reese, James W. Weiss, Arnold  
Regan, Frank G., Jr. Werner, Robert A.  
Reider, Robert D. Westcott, Maurice E.  
Restelle, Charles F. Westley, Samuel J.  
Jr. Whitman, Jack K.  
Rice, Donald K. Whitland, Martin J.  
Riffle, Harry J. Wise, Harry W., Jr.  
Riggs, Lawrence B., Jr. Wolf, Merwin  
Romzick, James P. Roy, Hector H.  
Rougeux, Lawrence J. Rucker, Henry W., Jr.  
Roth, Henry W., Jr. Wright, Francis H.  
Samuels, Benford L. Wuthrich, Frederick  
Saul, Charles O. J.  
Sawusch, Raymond H. Yonally, James F.  
Sawyer, Charles K. Zawrotny, Raymond  
Schneider, Leon E. Ziemer, Donald N.  
Schoemaker, Darvin Zuber, Walter H., Jr.  
D. Zweifler, Leonard J.

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bower, Harold R. McMichael, Allen E.  
Briggs, Dennis L. Perkins, Ralph  
Charles, John P. Puckett, Lucien E.  
Gaspar, Andrew J. Still, Donald E.

## NURSE CORPS

Andrus, Viola L. Evans, Elizabeth L.  
Belezos, Caliope M. Fisk, Grace O.  
Burns, Anna M. Glynn, Catherine M.  
Byers, Celia S. Griz, Albena I.  
Carpenter, Barbara J. Griz, Aldona M.  
Chadwick, Katherine Hanley, Eleanor T.  
Chittick, Marian F. Hanson, Dorothy J.  
Corbin, Dorothy E. Hill, Gretchen S.  
Cox, Ann B. Hogan, Hazel L.  
DalMaso, Amelia M. Kuenzi, Pauline J.  
Drakes, Ellen E. Laughlin, Kathleen M.

Madsen, Gladys  
Marco, Helen  
Markosky, Dolores M.  
Reese, Mary D.  
Reld, Johanna  
Ristoff, Dorothy A.  
Rowe, Constance H.  
Schweiger, Dorothy L.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Beverlee J. Hopf, Margaret E.  
Barteau, Cella L. Krebs, Frances J.  
Bittner, Emily C. Lintott, Catherine  
Borbridge, Dorothy A. Lloyd, Rebecca A.  
Cady, Joan J. McMillan, Margaret A.  
Darr, Dorothy J. Read, Elizabeth A.  
Dehart, Gloria F. Reed, Susan K.  
Dobson, Barbara J. Richardson, Marjorie  
Duacsek, Ada L. R. L.  
Fralic, Jimmie R. Stolarow, Rhoda L.  
Gore, Mary A. Till, Marilyn J.  
Harrison, Mary L. Zook, Joan E.  
Helleberg, Jacquelin

Lt. (junior grade) Katherine Keating, Medical Service Corps, United States Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Stanley Meeks, Dental Corps, United States Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

## LINE

Abeles, Charles C. Averyt, Howell D.  
Abernethy, Robert B. Babine, Arthur L., Jr.  
Ackerman, Richard F. Bachle, Carl F., Jr.  
Ackerson, David J. Bacon, James E.  
Adair, Frederick S. Bader, John P., Jr.  
Addis, Robert W. Badger, Robyn L.  
Alberty, Owen N. Badgett, John J.  
Aldern, Donald D. Badt, Milton B., Jr.  
Alexander, Marvin G. Bahm, John J.  
Alexander, John P. Balch, Alfred H.  
Alexich, Milton P. Baldrige, Louis D., Jr.  
Allen, Robert D. Balmain, Leslie H.  
Allen, Robert R. Bandurraga, Thomas, Jr.  
Allison, Robert C. Banghart, Leslie L.  
Altwegg, David M. Banks, William E., IV  
Ambler, Kirby P. Banner, Conrad S.  
Amor, Raymond C. Barbee, Delbert F.  
Amoruso, John J. Barker, Merle M.  
Anaston, Tommy K. Barron, Randall K.  
Jr. Barry, Peter F.  
Anderle, Charles K. Bartlett, Donald A.  
Anderson, Alden B. Bartling, Mebus  
Anderson, Charles A. Bates, John A., Jr.  
Anderson, Duane E. Battin, Peter C.  
Anderson, Roger A. Bauchspies, Frank T.  
Andrade, Leo R., Jr. Bauer, Howard J.  
Andrews, Charles E. Baum, James R.  
III. Bean, Irving J.  
Andrews, Leon L. Beck, Glenn A.  
Andrews, Rex D. Beech, Wayne "L"  
Angevine, Franklin L., Jr. Beecher, John D.  
Aquadro, Lincoln Benjamin, Richard L.  
Argiro, Vincent J. Bennett, Alexander K.  
Arison, Rae E. Bennett, David R.  
Armatrout, Merritt F. Bennett, Thomas J.  
Armitstead, Paul T. Benson, Charles W.  
Armstrong, Thomas Benson, Merrill R.  
F. Benton, Hugh A.  
Arp, Phillip S. Berg, Richard C.  
Arroyo, Gilbert L. Berndt, Donald J.  
Ashley, William H. Berry, George H., Jr.  
Ashman, Lee E. Berry, Raymond L., Jr.  
Ask, Thomas B. H. Bestler, James M.  
Jr. Bethke, Earl E., Jr.  
Atamian, Leon J. Bevington, David M.

Billion, Olivier R. Canby, Thomas Y., Jr.  
Blodeau, Armand A. Cantacuzene, Rodion  
Bluff, Allan L. Cardeiro, Charles P.  
Bird, Charles S. Carl, William T.  
Bishop, Daniel M. Carlisle, David R.  
Bivenour, Charles A., Carlstead, Robert H.  
Jr. Carroll, Edward E., Jr.  
Bixby, Harry L., Jr. Carroll, William E.  
Blackadar, Paul F. Carson, Ralph  
Blackwood, Jack D. Carter, Tandy W.  
Blades, Lawrence T. Caruso, Richard P.  
Blair, Closkey L., Jr. Case, George P., Jr.  
Blair, Robert M. Case, Richard W.  
Blanding, Robert L. Cassani, Henry L.  
Blide, Dan C. Casser, Donald G.  
Blohm, Ralph W. Cassidy, Joseph B., Jr.  
Blount, William K. Cates, Frederick S., Jr.  
Blue, Earl R. Caudill, William E.  
Bolander, Jack "C" Caulk, Robert F.  
Bolger, Justin C. Caulkins, Thomas V., III  
Borden, Lucien P. Chadwick, John R.  
Boreri, Richard S. Chalk, Jeff "D", III  
Bos, Roger C. Chalmers, Robert A.  
Bose, Robert B. Chambers, Lawrence C.  
Bosse, Joseph H., Jr. Charbonneau, George L.  
Bowen, William S. Chasse, Robert L.  
Bowman, Donald E. Cheatham, Augustus B.  
Box, Eugene L. Cheek, Ralph L.  
Boyer, Kenneth G. Chesky, James A.  
Boyle, Richard J. Chinn, Clarence E.  
Brackney, Louis S. Chittenden, Richard M.  
Bradshaw, Brice L. Christensen, Donald A.  
Brady, Donald G. Branyon, James C.  
Brady, John H., Jr. Bress, Allyn  
Brandel, William J., Jr. Brewster, Vernon H., Jr.  
Brandfuss, Dean W. Briska, Philip T.  
Brannon, James C. Brooks, Alfred P.  
Bress, Allyn Brooks, Walter A.  
Brewster, Vernon H., Jr. Brooks, William E.  
Brisk, Philip T. Broshar, John C.  
Brooks, Alfred P. Brown, Charles H.  
Brooks, Walter A. Brown, Donald N.  
Brooks, William E. Brown, George W. M.  
Broshar, John C. Brown, Gideon L., Jr.  
Brown, Charles H. Brown, Jacob C.  
Brown, Donald N. Brown, James R.  
Brown, George W. M. Brown, Laurence A., Jr.  
Brown, Gideon L., Jr. Brown, Richard N.  
Brown, Jacob C. Brown, Robert M.  
Brown, James R. Brown, Willoughby D.  
Brown, Laurence A., Jr. Brownley, John H.  
Brown, Richard N. Brownrigg, Richard T.  
Brown, Robert M. Bruning, Richard A.  
Brown, Willoughby D. Brunner, Edward A.  
Brownley, John H. Buck, Donald D.  
Brownrigg, Richard T. Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.  
Bruning, Richard A. Bull, David M.  
Brunner, Edward A. Burckmyer, Lawrence L.  
Buck, Donald D. Burger, Richard L.  
Buckholts, Walter H., Jr. Burgess, Norman A.  
Bull, David M. Burgin, Joe C., Jr.  
Burckmyer, Lawrence L. Burke, Gerald  
Burger, Richard L. Burke, William J.  
Burgess, Norman A. Burkhardt, Paul C.  
Burgin, Joe C., Jr. Burnett, John H.  
Burke, Gerald Burnham, Rowland E.  
Burke, William J. Burns, Richard C.  
Burkhart, Paul C. Burrige, Herbert M.  
Burnett, John H. Burstin, Harold L.  
Burnham, Rowland E. Busch, Donald F.  
Burns, Richard C. Bush, James T.  
Burrige, Herbert M. Cagney, Thomas P.  
Burstyn, Harold L. Calif, Toxey H.  
Busch, Donald F. Calkins, Robert E.  
Bush, James T. Callaghan, Jerry E.  
Cagney, Thomas P. Callahan, Cornelius P., Jr.  
Calif, Toxey H. Cameron, Donald A.  
Calkins, Robert E. Campbell, Ronald A.  
Callaghan, Jerry E. Campbell, Richard H.  
Callahan, Cornelius P., Jr. Curran, Lowell F., Jr.  
Cameron, Donald A. Curran, Robert W.

- Cywin, Lawrence  
 Dahlen, Wallace A.  
 Dalplan, Joseph H.  
 Danaher, James W.  
 Danell, Paul W.  
 Danneel, Clifford M.  
 Dapocny, Robert J.  
 Darrell, Charles G.  
 Davee, Robert C.  
 Davey, John N.  
 Davidson, Charles H.  
 Davidson, Christie H.  
 Davies, Paul G.  
 Davis, Daniel T.  
 Davis, James G.  
 Davis, James R.  
 Davis, Jimmie E.  
 Davis, Ralph E.  
 Davis, Robert D.  
 Davis, Thomas L.  
 Davis, William K.  
 Davison, David D.  
 Davison, Hessel L.  
 Defriez, Edwin H.  
 Demun, Taylor K.  
 Denbigh, Robert S. Jr.  
 Deppen, John B.  
 Deer, John P.  
 Dersin, Clement  
 Desjardin, John W.  
 Dewispelaere, Earl L.  
 Dickerson, Jaime E.  
 Dieffenbach, Otto W. Jr.  
 Dietz, Richard C.  
 Dimitruk, Eugene  
 Dimmick, David K.  
 Dion, Laurent N.  
 Dixon, Thomas M.  
 Dobbins, Robert N. Jr.  
 Dodge, Robert S.  
 Dodson, Charles H. Jr.  
 Doermann, Humphrey  
 Dolan, John F.  
 Donahue, Thomas W.  
 Donihue, James B.  
 Dooley, Charles E., Jr.  
 Dorman, Gerald H.  
 D'Orn, David W.  
 Dorso, James N.  
 Doty, John P.  
 Doughan, Joseph P.  
 Doyle, William J.  
 Drake, Frank D.  
 Dreger, Harry D.  
 Dresser, David I.  
 Drews, Sheldon  
 Dreyer, George J.  
 Driver, Glenn C., Jr.  
 Drummond, Oliver E.  
 Duckett, Philip V. H.  
 Duclos, Paul J.  
 Duff, Ernest A.  
 Duke, Frank M.  
 Dunn, Theodore Y., Jr.  
 Dupree, Thomas P.  
 Dyer, George T., Jr.  
 Dyett, Maxwell J.  
 Dykers, Andrew W.  
 Dykers, Thomas M., Jr.  
 Dysart, Roger A.  
 Eagleton, Richard E.  
 Eakin, James E.  
 Ebbert, Donald G.  
 Ebbert, Edwin L.  
 Echols, Kenneth W.  
 Eddy, William C., Jr.  
 Eddy, William P., III  
 Edlund, Timothy W.  
 Edmunds, Philip H.  
 Eggen, Burton M.  
 Eggert, Lowell F.  
 Ekman, Roger E.  
 Elder, James C.  
 Elne, Gervase F., Jr.  
 Eller, Richard L.  
 Elliott, Charles L.  
 Elliott, Richard G.
- Ellison, John C.  
 Emmons, Willard F.  
 Endsley, John H., Jr.  
 English, Joseph A., Jr.  
 Engquist, Gordon W.  
 Enos, Ralph L.  
 Ensign, Frank B., Jr.  
 Epping, Robert A.  
 Epstein, Charles S.  
 Ersamer, Franco M.  
 Eshman, John R.  
 Evanco, John R.  
 Ewy, Howard W.  
 Fadden, Michael F.  
 Faessel, Matthew W.  
 Faisant, Robin D.  
 Fakoury, Ernest P.  
 Farrell, Joseph A., III  
 Farris, George K.  
 Fasnacht, William E.  
 Faver, Walter M.  
 Fay, Edward S.  
 Federico, Charles D.  
 Feely, Robert J.  
 Fehrman, Gerald L.  
 Feller, Donald L.  
 Fellingham, Robert W.  
 Fenn, Edward M.  
 Fenton, Thomas T.  
 Ferguson, William F.  
 Field, Richard L.  
 Fielder, Robert D.  
 Filburn, William S.  
 Fisher, Robert W.  
 Fisher, William G., Jr.  
 Fitts, Jean M.  
 Fitzgerald, Nathan M., Jr.  
 Flaherty, James H., Jr.  
 Flaherty, Michael P.  
 Fleeman, Frederick M.  
 Fleeson, Richard J.  
 Fleischer, Allan A.  
 Flitter, Wallace F.  
 Flucker, Ronald L.  
 Fogarty, Michael J.  
 Foley, William M.  
 Fonville, Henry P.  
 Forbes, John, Jr.  
 Ford, Leon E., Jr.  
 Forrester, James H.  
 Foster, John F.  
 Fowler, Richard T.  
 Fowler, William L.  
 Fox, Raymond G.  
 Foy, Edward W.  
 Francis, Thomas L.  
 Franklin, Billy D.  
 Franzen, Edward C., Jr.  
 Freeland, Thomas H., III  
 Frohman, Louis T.  
 Fuller, Jack R.  
 Furlow, Charles M., III  
 Gaebler, James E.  
 Gair, Bruce O.  
 Gallen, Lawrence C.  
 Gantt, Martin B., Jr.  
 Gardner, Arnold G.  
 Gardner, Howard W.  
 Garland, Daniel H.  
 Garofalos, John  
 Garvin, Robert G.  
 Gasche, Arnold C.  
 Gash, Donald E.  
 Gaskin, Herbert L., Jr.  
 Gassaway, Charles L., Jr.  
 Gaston, Gerald W.  
 Gates, Harold R., Jr.  
 Gatje, George C.  
 Gauthier, John O.  
 Gayman, Wendell R.  
 Gaynor, Robert C.  
 Geiger, Lin T.  
 Genter, Ernest R., Jr.  
 Gerlach, Richard E.  
 Gerling, Carl R.  
 Gerwe, Eugene F.  
 Gery, Herbert C., Jr.  
 Geyman, John P.
- Gibbins, Gareth W.  
 Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.  
 Giedraitis, Robert B.  
 Gifford, James M.  
 Gilgen, Albert R.  
 Gill, Chester C., Jr.  
 Gillan, Martin J., III  
 Gillrist, Paul T.  
 Gillies, Richard W.  
 Gillig, Benjamin  
 Gilligan, Eugene F., Jr.  
 Ginn, Robert L.  
 Gire, Howard A.  
 Gleason, Richard E.  
 Glenn, James J., Jr.  
 Glerum, James N.  
 Gnadt, Frederic  
 Godman, Carl L.  
 Goldschmidt, Jack P., Jr.  
 Golenor, John A.  
 Gooding, William J., Jr.  
 Goodwin, Robert W.  
 Gordon, David E.  
 Gordon, Harry E., Jr.  
 Graham, Andrew J.  
 Graham, Bruce H.  
 Grammer, Frederick P., Jr.  
 Grant, John, Jr.  
 Grant, Richard T.  
 Gray, Harvey, Jr.  
 Gray, James H.  
 Gray, Walter S., III  
 Green, Morris J.  
 Greene, Ernest H.  
 Gregory, James W. P., Jr.  
 Gregory, William A., Jr.  
 Griffith, Donald E.  
 Griggs, Arthur E.  
 Griswold, Don W.  
 Groehn, Gerhard C.  
 Gronewold, George F.  
 Gronlund, Thomas R.  
 Gross, Ralph, Jr.  
 Grossheim, Ralph E.  
 Grossman, Herbert L.  
 Gruppe, Henry E.  
 Gunn, William J.  
 Gurney, Charles E., III  
 Gusdonovich, John, Jr.  
 Gustaff, Vito J. V.  
 Haest, Martin J.  
 Hagan, James S.  
 Hagen, Donald L.  
 Hagensick, William H.  
 Haigh, Alfred D., Jr.  
 Halbrooks, William J.  
 Half, John F.  
 Hall, Paul F.  
 Hall, Peter T.  
 Halladay, Jack F.  
 Hamilton, Arthur N.  
 Hamilton, Edgar W.  
 Hamilton, Leo L.  
 Hamilton, Leroy A.  
 Hannegan, Frank N.  
 Hansen, Robert F.  
 Hansen, Whitney  
 Hansen, William A.  
 Hanson, Donald O.  
 Hardesty, John F.  
 Hardesty, Loyd B.  
 Hardisty, Huntington  
 Harling, Frederick F., Jr.  
 Harlow, Albert L.  
 Harp, Robert M.  
 Harper, Edwin F., Jr.  
 Harper, Rollin H., Jr.  
 Harrington, Donald E.  
 Harris, Cecil J., Jr.  
 Harris, David G.  
 Harris, Douglas H., Jr.  
 Harris, Jack R.
- Harrison, James H., Jr.  
 Harrison, Varick D.  
 Hart, John R.  
 Hart, Richard L.  
 Harthorn, William G.  
 Hartley, John D.  
 Hartman, Robert T.  
 Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.  
 Hartranft, Milton L.  
 Hasenwinkle, Earl D.  
 Hatcher, George M.  
 Hatcher, John L.  
 Haveman, "O" "H", Jr.  
 Hawes, David W.  
 Hawk, Conrad F., Jr.  
 Hayes, Morris L.  
 Hayutin, David L.  
 Headley, Allen B.  
 Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.  
 Hedges, Ralph R.  
 Heffernan, George A.  
 Heighway, John E.  
 Heigl, Frederick T.  
 Heins, Robert A.  
 Helgeson, Warren A.  
 Helgeson, Norman G.  
 Helland, Gerald H.  
 Helt, Franklin R., Jr.  
 Hennes, Randolph Y.  
 Henson, Otis A.  
 Hervey, Frank, Jr.  
 Hess, Adolph W., Jr.  
 Hess, Paul J.  
 Hickey, James F.  
 Hickman, William J.  
 Hicks, Harold F., Jr.  
 Hicks, Lawrence F.  
 Higgs, Richard F.  
 Hilfrank, William E.  
 Hill, George W., Jr.  
 Hill, John W.  
 Hill, Lucio W.  
 Hines, Edward L.  
 Hipple, William J.  
 Hirvi, Henry E.  
 Hirz, Joseph D.  
 Hiscok, David F.  
 Hobbs, Billy B.  
 Hoenie, Clifford E.  
 Hofer, John F.  
 Hogan, Robert L.  
 Hoge, James H.  
 Hollandsworth, Roy M.  
 Hollick, Frederick B.  
 Holmberg, Lennart G.  
 Holmes, William P.  
 Honeycutt, Robert D.  
 Honeywell, James O., Jr.  
 Horn, Donald N.  
 Horne, Charles F., III  
 Horrocks, Jay "B"  
 Horwath, John A.  
 Hostetler, Robert J.  
 House, Harry M.  
 House, Rodney M.  
 Hubbard, Dwight E.  
 Hudson, Earl M.  
 Huesgen, Eugene L.  
 Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.  
 Hull, George T.  
 Hull, Lynne H., II  
 Hultkrans, Hilding R.  
 Hunter, Glenn A.  
 Hunter, Thomas H., Jr.  
 Husmann, Donald  
 Hyde, Oliver W., Jr.  
 Hyde, Robert A.  
 Hyers, Kemper K.  
 Hynes, William J.  
 Iannotti, Lawrence W.  
 Ikeler, Harold E., Jr.  
 Ilseman, Frederick J., Jr.  
 Ingersoll, Richard W.  
 Inman, Wayne D.  
 Itzkan, Irving
- Ivey, John S.  
 Ivey, John H.  
 Jackson, Davis H.  
 Jackson, Dempster M.  
 Jackson, Emmette G., Jr.  
 Jackson, Robert G.  
 Jacob, Robert E.  
 Jacobs, Charles E., Jr.  
 Jacobson, William A.  
 Jagel, Robert C.  
 Jameson, Henry C., Jr.  
 Jansen, Gerhard C. J.  
 Jarboe, George G.  
 Jarosz, Joseph A.  
 Jarrett, Alonzo C.  
 Jaycox, Randall E.  
 Jayne, Gordon H.  
 Jeanes, Lincoln D., Jr.  
 Jeffries, John W.  
 Jennett, John W.  
 Jezek, George M.  
 Johannsen, Robert A.  
 Johns, Burton E.  
 Johnson, Alan H.  
 Johnson, Dale W.  
 Johnson, Donald L.  
 Johnson, Donald M.  
 Johnson, Eric W.  
 Johnson, Frederick W., Jr.  
 Johnson, Frederick C.  
 Johnson, Glenn M.  
 Johnson, Guy D.  
 Johnson, Kenneth H.  
 Johnson, Oriz W.  
 Johnson, Philip E.  
 Johnson, Robert M.  
 Johnson, Robert C.  
 Johnson, Ronald C.  
 Johnston, Douglas F.  
 Jones, John P.  
 Jones, Richard H.  
 Jones, Robert C.  
 Jordan, Clive N.  
 Josephson, Henning C.  
 Joubert, Douglas J.  
 Judah, Nelson V.  
 Kaczmarek, Carl C.  
 Kaiser, Karl D.  
 Kampe, Robert F.  
 Karvala, Curtis A.  
 Kasehagen, Arthur T.  
 Kay, Jack G.  
 Keane, James P.  
 Keeschull, Herbert W.  
 Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.  
 Kenney, William E., Jr.  
 Kelleher, Ronald W.  
 Keller, John A.  
 Kelley, Frederick W.  
 Kelley, John P., Jr.  
 Kelley, Robert F.  
 Kelln, Albert L.  
 Kennedy, David R., Jr.  
 Kennedy, Martin H., Jr.  
 Kennedy, Ronald W.  
 Kennedy, Robert C.  
 Kennedy, William B.  
 Kenny, John J.  
 Kenyon, Jack A.  
 Kermes, Albert J.  
 Kershaw, Daniel J.  
 Kidd, Charles R.  
 Kidd, Vernon G.  
 Kidd, William S.  
 Klechel, Doane F., Jr.  
 Kilduff, Paul E.  
 Kilhefner, Paul T., Jr.  
 Kilian, Michael J.  
 King, Charles W.  
 King, Lyman S.  
 King, Terry D.  
 Kinnebrew, Thomas R.  
 Kinrier, Richard R.  
 Kirbach, David S.  
 Kirby, Albert D.  
 Kirk, Myrl S.  
 Kirkman, William J.
- Kitchens, William L.  
 Klein, Donald E.  
 Klein, Irving  
 Klein, Patrick E.  
 Klenk, Eugene L.  
 Knauss, Robert L.  
 Knipple, Herbert C.  
 Knoll, David W.  
 Knopp, William A.  
 Knowles, Arthur D.  
 Knutson, Wilbert D.  
 Kocak, Theodore J.  
 Koch, Joseph  
 Koehler, Walter C., Jr.  
 Koehne, Richard J.  
 Kohler, Walter, Jr.  
 Kolankiewicz, Robert A.  
 Korb, Lawrence J.  
 Korbitz, Robert F.  
 Koslow, Jack E.  
 Kosmela, Walter T.  
 Kovanic, Edward F.  
 Kovarick, Frank L.  
 Kraft, Frederick W.  
 Krayner, Robert S.  
 Kreps, Allyn O.  
 Kuhn, John G.  
 Kuncas, John W.  
 Kunnath, Jerome G., Jr.  
 Kunze, Martin W.  
 Kuzenski, Kenneth F.  
 Laak, Edwin F.  
 Lackey, Harry A., II  
 Lacy, Joe R.  
 Lafalce, Peter R.  
 Lambert, Lloyd M., Jr.  
 Lancaster, Robert W.  
 Lance, William R.  
 Lander, Richard A.  
 Langford, John M.  
 Langley, Lawrence W.  
 Langloh, Walther G.  
 Larsen, Richard L.  
 Larson, David T., Jr.  
 Laskey, Richard P.  
 Lasseter, Jack K.  
 Lauderdale, Robert A.  
 Lailor, Richard J.  
 Laux, William J., Jr.  
 Lavin, Charles V.  
 Law, Thomas L.  
 Lawless, John H.  
 Layman, Lawrence  
 Leach, Richard P. P.  
 Lechner, George B.  
 Ledbetter, James A.  
 Lees, Frederick J.  
 Leftwich, James M.  
 Legg, Douglas R.  
 Lenox, Glen W.  
 Levy, Ted  
 Lewis, Harold M. J., Jr.  
 Lewis, James T.  
 Lidel, Carl J.  
 Lincoln, David.  
 Lippincott, James E.  
 Lipski, Arthur A.  
 Liston, Thomas L.  
 Locke, Walter M.  
 Lockwood, Douglas L.  
 Lockwood, Forrest P.  
 Loftus, John A.  
 Logan, Wilfred J.  
 Lohman, John A.  
 Long, Thornton M.  
 Looney, Francis L.  
 Loposer, Avery K., Jr.  
 Lorenz, Robert F.  
 Lossing, Fay A., Jr.  
 Louchheim, William S., Jr.  
 Loudon, Robert O.  
 Loughlin, William J.  
 Louzensky, George J.  
 Lovell, James A., Jr.  
 Lucas, William R.  
 Luckett, Thomas W.  
 Lumsden, Richard E.  
 Lurie, Fred M.  
 Lykes, William F. G.



- Lyman, Alexander S.  
Lyons, James A., Jr.  
Lyons, Robert D.  
Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.  
Maatta, Gilbert H.  
MacDonald, William P.  
MacGregor, Herbert C.  
MacLeod, Kenneth H.  
MacPherson, John J.  
Madedo, Joseph F., Jr.  
Madigan, James A.  
Maich, Robert C.  
Majesky, John D.  
Malament, Jerome M.  
Mallace, Alexander D.  
Malone, John S.  
Maloney, Peter M.  
Manara, Vincent J., Jr.  
Mandley, Wilfred J., Jr.  
Manfredi, John P.  
Mann, Charles R.  
Mann, Robert E.  
Manning, Charles D.  
Marble, Richard W.  
Marin, Juan R.  
Marino, Lawrence L.  
Marlor, Russell L.  
Marn, Louis E.  
Marrison, Robert W.  
Marron, James V.  
Marshall, Donald A.  
Marshall, James J.  
Marshall, John C.  
Marshall, Michael M.  
Martens, William H.  
Martin, Alexander, Jr.  
Martin, Clyde D., Jr.  
Martin, Tyrone G.  
Martineau, James P.  
Martz, Charles R., Jr.  
Maslin, Charles W.  
Masse, Donald M.  
Mathis, Thomas R.  
Maus, Lee J.  
Mayes, Jared D., III  
Maynard, James H., Jr.  
McBrayer, James B.  
McCafterty, William E.  
McCarty, Richard W.  
McClannan, Ralph L.  
McCollum, Arthur H., Jr.  
McConnell, Thomas O.  
McCune, Joe D.  
McCutcheon, Edwin L.  
McDonald, Clyde D.  
McDonald, Robert P.  
McDowell, Russell N.  
McElhattan, James R., II  
McEligot, Donald M.  
McGaughey, Richard W.  
McGaw, Richard W.  
McGee, Bernard J.  
McGeough, Robert S.  
McGlinn, William D.  
McGregor, Jack R.  
McKee, Robert X.  
McKenny, James L.  
McLaughlin, Richard A.  
McLemore, Ralph S., Jr.  
McMillan, Louis K., Jr.  
McNeely, James S.  
McNeill, Archibald J., Jr.  
McPadden, Donald F. X.
- McWilliam, John R.  
McWilliams, Frederick F.  
Mead, Theodore E.  
Meardon, Louis F.  
Meeks, Thomas L.  
Meigs, Gilbert R.  
Melson, Hollard R., Jr.  
Meltzer, Melvin  
Merrill, Forrest "J"  
Messmer, Everett P.  
Mester, Ernest L., Jr.  
Metz, Forrest E.  
Meyers, John E.  
Meyers, Walter T.  
Mhoon, Fred M.  
Michaels, Robert J.  
Michie, Harold W.  
Mighell, John H.  
Millard, Junius W.  
Miller, Bruce A.  
Miller, Charles E.  
Miller, John L., Jr.  
Miller, Kenneth R.  
Miller, Phillip  
Miller, Richard J.  
Miller, Robert F.  
Miller, Robert L.  
Mills, Roger E.  
Mireault, Norman G.  
Mitchell, Gregory A., Jr.  
Mitchell, "J" Wallace  
Mitchell, John R. C.  
Mitchell, Leland G.  
Mizell, Hardy P., Jr.  
Moehle, Robert C.  
Mohrman, "J" "H"  
Moncure, Edwin C., Jr.  
Moody, Thomas J.  
Moore, Arthur H.  
Moore, Charles E.  
Moore, Charles D.  
Moore, Clarence E.  
Moore, Ernest M., Jr.  
Moore, Mallie B.  
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.  
Moran, Thomas P.  
Morgan, William N.  
Morley, Kenneth B.  
Morley, Robert R.  
Morris, Henry C., Jr.  
Morris, Robert E.  
Morrison, Daniel N.  
Morrison, Julian K., III  
Morrison, Royden U.  
Morrow, George F.  
Morse, David S.  
Moses, Allen D.  
Moss, McKenzie  
Moss, William C., Jr.  
Mountford, Edward J.  
Moylan, Robert J.  
Mullane, Thomas F.  
Mulloy, Paul J.  
Muncy, William E.  
Munsell, Raymond T.  
Munson, Jack V.  
Murdock, Lloyd E.  
Murphy, Douglas C.  
Murphy, Gerald E.  
Murray, Robert A.  
Myers, Clayton C., Jr.  
Myers, David M.  
Mylander, Stig J.  
Nachtrab, Herbert R., Jr.  
Nachtsheim, Philip R.  
Nalen, Craig A.  
Naugle, James O.  
Nelson, Jack H.  
Nelson, James N.  
Nelson, Leroy C.  
Nelson, Raymond A.  
Nerheim, Noble M.  
Neumann, Donald E.  
Newland, Charles W.  
Newman, Wilbur D.
- Newsome, James W.  
Newton, Howard J., Jr.  
Newton, Robert B.  
Niedbala, Thomas F.  
Niederkrone, James S.  
Nieler, Ralph T.  
Norling, Richard E.  
Norman, Thomas V., Jr.  
Norris, James L.  
Northup, Wilmer R., Jr.  
Norton, Richard J.  
Nowak, Theo T.  
Numbers, Earl W.  
Nunneley, James K.  
Nyvold, Robert H.  
Obrey, Robert L.  
O'Brien, Austin C., Jr.  
O'Brien, James J.  
O'Connell, John F.  
O'Connell, Linus J.  
O'Connor, Dennis E. W.  
O'Connor, Edward L.  
O'Connor, John E.  
Oder, Howard W.  
Odman, William A.  
O'Donnell, Canton, Jr.  
O'Donnell, John W.  
O'Hanesson, Gregory S.  
O'Haren, Patrick J., Jr.  
O'Kane, John D.  
Okun, Sherman K.  
Olandt, Robert H.  
Oldham, Albert W.  
O'Leary, Jeremiah D., Jr.  
Olson, Darwin D.  
Olson, Richard S.  
Olson, William, Jr.  
Organ, James W.  
O'Rourke, Joseph J.  
Orr, John D.  
Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.  
Orzalli, John B.  
Osgood, Franklin T., Jr.  
Ott, Billie D.  
Owen, George E.  
Owen, John R.  
Pacl, Lawrence J.  
Paff, George H.  
Palo, David B.  
Paluso, Edward M.  
Pappas, Sophocles G.  
Parch, Joseph R.  
Paris, Thomas A.  
Parker, John R.  
Parker, Millard M.  
Parmer, Merle E.  
Parrish, Thomas K., III  
Parrish, Vernon L.  
Patterson, James R.  
Pavloff, George  
Payne, Douglas W.  
Payne, George P.  
Pearce, Earl H.  
Pearse, Roger N.  
Pearson, Clinton J.  
Pearson, John F., Jr.  
Pecaut, Richard A.  
Peelle, Morris A.  
Pelton, Paul C., Jr.  
Pennypacker, William S.  
Perkins, Raymond B.  
Perl, Burton K.  
Perry, William N.  
Peters, Herbert J.  
Peters, Paul F.  
Petersen, Arnold O., Jr.  
Peterson, John B., Jr.  
Peterson, Marvin A.  
Peterson, Norman G.  
Petherick, George L.  
Pettigrew, Richard R.  
Phillips, Frederic M.  
Phillips, Robert A.
- Phillips, Robert N.  
Phillips, William G.  
Pierce, Ray E.  
Pierson, William R.  
Pike, Thomas J.  
Pike, William E.  
Pilon, Jerome R.  
Ping, Vernon "S", Jr.  
Piper, Harold L.  
Pipkin, Robert G., Jr.  
Pittman, Paul H.  
Plager, Sheldon J.  
Platt, Grafton S.  
Plow, Arthur E.  
Podaras, Nicholas C.  
Podsiadlo, Edwin L.  
Pogson, Charles H.  
Pohli, Richard R.  
Polatty, Donald B.  
Polen, Charles R.  
Poling, William E.  
Pollak, Charles D.  
Pollak, Morris  
Poor, William C.  
Porter, Alvin J.  
Porter, Asa S.  
Post, Robert E., Jr.  
Postak, John N.  
Postich, George  
Potts, Raymond A.  
Pratt, Richard W.  
Preble, Russell A., Jr.  
Precht, Robert H., Jr.  
Pregnall, William S.  
Prezioso, Ronald  
Price, David J.  
Price, Robert T.  
Pugh, Jack M.  
Pulley, Gerald P.  
Pusey, Richard D.  
Pyrton, John E., Jr.  
Quartararo, Michael A.  
Quick, Jay E.  
Quimby, William E.  
Quinn, Clayton W.  
Quinn, Robert T.  
Rafalowski, Joseph W., Jr.  
Railing, James M.  
Ramsey, Forrest G., Jr.  
Randall, Thomas R.  
Randolph, Joseph L.  
Randolph, Thomas F.  
Rankin, George M., Jr.  
Ransdell, Paul E.  
Rapkin, Jerome  
Ratenburg, Robert N.  
Ravan, Landrum E.  
Ray, Glen P.  
Rayburn, Ralph G.  
Raymer, Edward C.  
Reed, Donald A.  
Reed, Richard W.  
Reed, Robert G.  
Reed, William H.  
Reeder, Ralph J.  
Reep, Harlan E.  
Regalia, Edmund L.  
Reichelderfer, Bruce A.  
Reif, William B.  
Relly, James F.  
Reischauer, Robert E.  
Remund, Robert N.  
Reynolds, David S., Jr.  
Reynolds, Robert R.  
Rhodes, John P.  
Rhodes, Stuart W.  
Riba, Robert  
Ricardo, Benny J.  
Rice, James O.  
Rich, Richard  
Richard, Jackson B.  
Richards, William D.  
Richardson, Howard P.  
Richter, Paul E.  
Ricks, Robert R.  
Ries, Allen L.  
Riggs, Weldon M.  
Riley, Tad T.  
Rinzel, Emery J.
- Rivers, Wendell B.  
Roane, Donald P.  
Roberts, Dean E.  
Roberts, Douglas H.  
Roberts, William E.  
Roberts, William E., Jr.  
Robinson, Adrian B.  
Robinson, Donald W.  
Robinson, Peter W.  
Roby, Grady H.  
Rickett, John S.  
Rockwell, Richard B.  
Rodgers, Frederick A.  
Rodrigue, Louis W., Jr.  
Roesch, Malvin B.  
Roeser, John F., Jr.  
Roessner, Eugene F.  
Rogers, Stephen H.  
Rollins, James "J"  
Ronnenbert, Francis G.  
Rood, Gerald D.  
Ross, Billy D.  
Ross, John P.  
Ross, Robert P.  
Roth, Irwin  
Roush, Randall C.  
Rowden, William H.  
Rowland, Mervin  
Rowland, Milton  
Roy, Clarence H.  
Rozell, Curtis J.  
Rudisill, Brantly  
Rudolph, Raymond F.  
Ruecker, Kenneth H.  
Ruesswick, Douglas L.  
Runser, James A.  
Russell, William D.  
Ryan, Donald W.  
Ryan, William J.  
Saffell, Arliss K.  
Sagerholm, James A.  
Salerno, Frank E.  
Salsbury, John F.  
Salmirs, Seymour  
Salsburg, David S.  
Sample, William H.  
Sanders, Joseph G.  
Sanford, Stephen J.  
Sanscrainte, Willard A.  
Santucci, Carlo V.  
Sapp, John, Jr.  
Saulnier, George I.  
Saxton, Frank  
Sayer, William D.  
Sayoc, Raymond G., Jr.  
Sayre, Robert E., Jr.  
Scalese, Anthony C., Jr.  
Scherer, Ralph S.  
Schluter, Hugo E.  
Schmitz, Charles J.  
Schmokol, Harold O.  
Schofield, John J.  
Schonenberg, Hans P.  
Schreiber, Leo R.  
Schucker, Raymond E.  
Schulze, Robert H.  
Schurr, Thomas P.  
Schwarz, Edward P., Jr.  
Scott, Michael  
Scott, William C.  
Searfus, William H.  
Seeger, Charles E.  
Segal, Philip D.  
Selby, Howard K.  
Seljos, Lloyd T.  
Sellers, Jeff C., Jr.  
Seligren, David M.  
Semotan, William F.  
Shafer, Lawrence  
Shaffer, George W.  
Shanahan, William F.  
Shannon, Eugene R., Jr.  
Sharts, Clay M.  
Shaver, Frank M.  
Shaw, Charles M.
- Shea, Philip J.  
Shearer, Burdett L.  
Sheehan, Charles J.  
Sheehan, John E.  
Sheehan, William F., Jr.  
Sheets, Andrew T.  
Sheldon, Robert E.  
Shelley, Leon R.  
Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.  
Sherar, Joseph W.  
Shettles, Mack W.  
Shillinger, George L., Jr.  
Shiver, Edwin C.  
Short, Francis R.  
Shuler, Ashley C., Jr.  
Shumway, John N.  
Siebert, John C.  
Siems, William R.  
Sierer, Payson D., Jr.  
Simms, James T., Jr.  
Simons, Donald W.  
Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.  
Sinclair, Valvin R., Jr.  
Slaughter, John R., Jr.  
Small, Joseph F.  
Smith, Addison R., II  
Smith, Bob L.  
Smith, Carol C., Jr.  
Smith, Clifford R.  
Smith, Frederick E., Jr.  
Smith, Gerald M.  
Smith, Gilbert E.  
Smith, Howard J.  
Smith, Howard W.  
Smith, Hugh T.  
Smith, James R.  
Smith, Jerrold C.  
Smith, John V.  
Smith, Keith D.  
Smith, Kenneth G.  
Smith, Lawrence L.  
Smith, Noel I.  
Smith, Orrell  
Smith, Richard C.  
Smith, Richard K.  
Smith, Samuel H., III  
Smith, St. Clair  
Smith, Verne W.  
Sneed, Beckom U.  
Snell, Glen A.  
Snider, Claude F., Jr.  
Snow, David T.  
Snyder, Allan E.  
Snyder, Fred D.  
Snyder, Herbert J. V.  
Snyder, Howard A.  
Snyder, James M.  
Sorensen, Everett B.  
Sothan, Norman L.  
Sovinski, Stanislaus J.  
Spencer, Harry A., Jr.  
Sperling, David J.  
Sperr, Andrew L.  
Spolinsky, Leon G. R.  
Sprehe, Paul F.  
Springer, Kay S.  
Squier, Lucius R., Jr.  
Stadelhofer, Robert R.  
Stafford, Richard L.  
Stamm, Richard H.  
Stanch, Harmon E. J.  
Stangl, Richard J.  
Stanley, Joseph K.  
Staple, David F.  
Stark, Arthur R., Jr.  
Stark, Peter A., Jr.  
Stauffer, Dale E.  
Steckbeck, Francis J.  
Stein, Norman F.  
Stein, Raymond W.  
Stelfox, James  
Stelt, John H.  
Stephens, George M., Jr.  
Stern, Charles A.  
Stern, Philip A.  
Stewart, Charles W.

Stewart, James P.	Wadsworth, Francis L.	Wilson, Richard S.	Sheets, Roger E.	Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.	Patterson, Frank H., Jr.
Stinner, Robert J.	Wagar, John A.	Wilson, Robert D.	Patridge, Roger H.	Hamilton, Walter S.	Peters, Richard D.
Stock, Richard L.	Waggoner, Donald E.	Wilson, Robert R.	McCardell, James E.	Helder, George K.	Phypers, Dean P.
Stolle, Edward S., Jr.	Wagner, Ralph L.	Wilson, Thomas O.	Person, Ross	Hill, Robert E.	Picht, George C.
Stone, James M.	Wagner, Richard M.	Winant, Barent P., III	Thomas, Donald P.	Hopkins, Jack W.	Polunsky, Robert "I"
Storper, Stanley A.	Wahrmund, Louis M.	Winkler, Richard C.	Thoreston, Glyn T.	Horrigan, James O.	Posey, Bruce G.
Stottlar, James F.	Wakeman, Curtiss O.	Winkler, Thomas Q.	Williams, Randall	Huhn, James V.	Poss, Henry M.
Stradtman, John F.	Walbert, William A.	Jr.	Jaburg, Conrad J.	Huising, Don L.	Potter, David W.
Strandjord, Paul E.	Jr.	Winterfield, Adrian B.	Edwards, Forrest L.	Humphreys, James A., Jr.	Pound, Carey
Strehlow, Paul V., Jr.	Walczak, Norbert F.	Winters, Charles A.	Benton, Jerry S.	Illig, Albert H.	Rains, William D.
Strockbine, Richard E.	Walden, John W.	Wise, William E.	Schaub, John R., Jr.	Ingram, Henry V.	Rech, Henry J.
Stromire, Leon C.	Walker, Elmer E.	Wiseman, Charles H.	Harris, James W.	Inman, John P.	Rhodes, Daniel M.
Strong, William L.	Walker, Homer L.	Wiseman, Hobart J.	Knight, Charles H.	Jackson, Arthur D.	Roman, William E.
Sugg, Ross E.	Walker, Samuel B.	Withers, Christopher	Spear, Willard W., Jr.	Johnson, David D.	Roper, Patrick E.
Sullivan, Alfred B.	Walker, William B.	Witty, Robert D.	Bachtel, Mary A.	Kelly, Robert C.	Rose, Robert Z.
Sullivan, George H.	Wallace, Cedric S.	Wolak, Joseph E.	Beane, Carolyn M.	Kindley, William E., II	Ross, John H.
Summit, Roger K.	Walsh, Thomas P.	Wolff, William M., Jr.	Boss, Jo E.	Kirchegessner, Robert A.	Rowley, Allyn E.
Sumser, Raymond J.	Walther, William J.	Wood, Cecil E.	Bradford, Alice V.	Lambert, David R.	Rupp, Glen L.
Sutherland, John A., Jr.	Wanemaker, Floyd E.	Wood, John F.	Brooks, Irma J.	Laveau, Phillip J., Jr.	Sabec, Edwin J.
Sutherland, Benjamin T. W.	Ward, Conley R.	Wood, Thomas H.	Brown, Julia A.	Lochrie, Gilbert H.	Sammons, Joseph E.
Swadley, "W" "C"	Ward, John E.	Woods, Searle W.	Burgess, Elizabeth H.	Lockwood, Albert N.	Sandrock, John E.
Swalley, Robert F.	Ward, Joseph V., Jr.	Woolway, James E.	Cass, Sylvia S.	Luallin, Norman D.	Schriner, James A.
Sweet, William J.	Warner, Paul M., Jr.	Wright, Philip H.	Clark, Marion J.	Luftglass, Murray A.	Scrudato, Joseph F.
Sweigert, Cloyd S.	Wasserman, Arthur L., Jr.	Wright, Richard L.	Coder, Margaret A.	MacLafferty, Paul S.	Sebes, Edward A.
Sylvester, Gerald D.	Waterloo, Francis C.	Wroth, Robert S.	Dantley, Audrey D.	Maier, Raymond G.	Shibley, Robert W.
Talkin, Philip S.	Watkins, Bobby B.	Wyatt, William C., III	Dewitt, Lois V.	Maldonado, Teodosio	Smith, Charles E.
Tanner, John W.	Watkins, Charles E., Jr.	Yamnick, John D.	Dixon, Ann	Martin, James H.	Smith, Reavell S.
Tarker, Matthew F., Jr.	Watt, Richard M.	Yates, Glen B.	Donovan, Patricia R.	Mason, Albert G.	Sovey, Louis T., Jr.
Taylor, Charles A.	Weaver, Carl B.	Yetman, William R.	Ellis, Shirley L.	Matson, Richard L.	Strange, Hubert E., Jr.
Taylor, Clinton W.	Weaver, Edward H.	Young, "J" Rollin, Jr.	Frawley, Mildred J.	McCoy, Thomas E., Jr.	Strickland, Robert L.
Taylor, Jack G. N.	Webber, Gene D.	Young, John C.	Garoutte, Joan	McDonald, Francis E.	Summer, William M.
Taylor, Robert S.	Webster, Charles H.	Young, Robert O.	Gautreaux, Helen	McGowan, Joseph J., Jr.	Swanson, Bruce W.
Teeter, Robert W.	Webster, Edward W. V.	Youngquist, John A.	Hanson, Elinor F.	McKeown, John M.	Thompson, Gerald J.
Tetreault, Paul J.	Webster, Jack T.	Yuill, Robert T.	Haugen, Sylvia N.	McVay, Richard L.	Thompson, Gerald J.
Thamm, Tom B.	Weeks, George H.	Yulsman, Sylvan A.	Hoy, Barbara J.	Miller, Allan R.	Trueblood, Howard G.
Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.	Wehking, Frederick W.	Zacharias, Jerrold M.	Kiley, Patricia E.	Mills, Richard F.	Vandegriff, Alvin L.
Tholl, Jack C.	Weigle, Wallace F.	Zastrow, Robert R.	Knoth, Madella L.	Morrison, Quinn B.	Vanert, Willard L.
Thomas, Alfred R., III	Welham, Robert M.	Zeithaml, Donald P.	Koons, Joan	Murphy, Joseph W.	Waller, Edmund M., Jr.
Thomas, Douglas N.	Weller, Thomas G., Jr.	Ziblich, Michael A.	Labonté, Nadene B.	Murphy, Maurice J.	Warren, Richard D.
Thomas, George C.	Wells, Eugene R., Jr.	Curry, Thomas E.	Lowrimore, Earlene	Murphy, Thomas P.	Watt, Robert C.
Thomas, James R.	Wentz, Howard B., Jr.	Bassett, Jerry S.	Mader, Barbara A.	Nelson, John R.	Wells, John L., Jr.
Thomas, Richard H., III	Wessman, Robert L.	Shepherd, David C.	Mandt, Maxine A.	Nieder, John D.	Werfel, Merton A.
Thomas, Robert F.	Wev, Bosquet N., Jr.	Daniels, Verlyne W.	Marshall, Alice C.	Noel, William L.	Whitney, William G.
Thomas, Svend E.	Wheeler, James W., Jr.	Nichols, John F.	Meadow, Jane	Nulty, Jerome B.	Witzler, James D.
Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.	White, John A.	Rosson, James W.	Miller, Elizabeth H.	Oelkers, Harvey S.	Wyman, Winthrop A.
Thompson, Clifford E.	White, John C.	Williams, Frank	Miller, Nancy J.	O'Malley, John A., Jr.	Yake, Richard T.
Thompson, Guy L.	White, Paul G., Jr.	LeBlanc, Georges E., Jr.	Nardi, Rosemarie L.	Palmer, William J., Jr.	York, William B., Jr.
Thompson, John L.	White, Richard K.	Clark, William	Nyman, Louise F.	Pancoast, John W., Jr.	Young, Wesley E.
Thompson, James J.	White, Steven A.	Painter, George V.	Phillips, Elizabeth C.	Parker, William W.	Allen, Nellie K.
Tiffany, Walton C.	Whiting, Albert W.	Wyatt, Charles M.	Prewitt, Edith E.	Parks, Garnet R.	Antolowitz, Gertrude
Till, Ernest A.	Whorton, William R.	McBrayer, John E., Jr.	Roberts, Betty J. W.		Gertrude
Timlin, Thomas N.	Widder, John A., Jr.	Archer, Burton E., Jr.	Robnett, Martha L.		Cynthia C.
Tinker, Richard V.	Widner, Ralph R.	Preston, Edgar H.	Rupp, Lois J.		Ruth M.
Todd, Alexander M.	Wilke, Stanford R.	Higgs, Jay D.	Savage, Peggy A.		White, Joan L.
Tombari, Henry A.	Wilder, Philip H.	Robertson, Coll E.	Screws, Margie A.		
Tomkiewicz, Ralph E.	Wilder, Richard D.	Kling, William T.	Smith, Claire L.		
Tonseth, Thomas H., III	Wilder, William E.	Caines, Robert H.	Smith, Martha B.		
Treiber, Arthur E.	Wildridge, Robert E.	Tobias, Robert E.	Sullivan, Barbara T.		
Treuhold, Charles R.	Willey, Kenneth R.	O'Neill, Louis C., Jr.	Thompson, Lloyd L.		
Troffer, George J., Jr.	Willey, Robert L., Jr.	Bozeman, Henry G.	White, Joanne E.		
Tucker, McKendree T.	Wilkens, John, Jr.	Agnew, Donald C.	Wier, Mary L.		
Turnage, Robert L.	Wilkerson, Robert B., III	Allenstein, Richard V.	Williams, Barbara A.		
Turner, Harvey S.	Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.	Appell, Leroy G.	Williamson, Mary L.		
Turner, James D.	Williams, Douglas A.	Baglow, Charles T.			
Turner, John B., Jr.	Williams, Edward J., Jr.	Balint, William S., Jr.			
Turpin, Lander H.	Williams, Floyd B.	Barrett, William L.			
Tuszynski, Raymond S.	Williams, Henry W., Jr.	Beagle, William T.			
Tuzo, Lamar W.	Williams, James E.	Beeson, Jerome F.			
Usliton, William B.	Williams, James G., III	Beier, Frederick R., Jr.			
Vahsen, George M.	Williamson, John C.	Benedict, Joseph W.			
Valade, Larry G.	Williamson, Paul W.	Blanchard, Townsend E.			
Vandine, Harold F., Jr.	Willis, Chesley E., Jr.	Bloom, Thomas F.			
Vanhouten, Laurence P.	Wilson, Donald K.	Bondurant, Edward J.			
Varley, James F.	Wilson, Edward W.	Boswell, Sam P.			
Vasey, Richard C.	Wilson, Francis M.	Boyle, John J.			
Vaught, John C.	Wilson, Harold K.	Bradshaw, Carl J.			
Vay, John P.	Wilson, Jack L.	Buckman, Robert S.			
Vickroy, William R.	Wilson, James E., Jr.	Burrell, Jack L.			
Victor, Francis W.	Wilson, James R.	Carroll, Robert H.			
Vincent, Dwight H.	Wilson, James W.	Carson, Donald E.			
Vine, Victor J.	Wilson, Randolph G., Jr.	Catanach, Anthony H.			
	Wilson, Richard H.	Clark, Alan F.			
		Close, Paul D., Jr.			
		Cohig, James C.			
		Conner, Berry, Jr.			
		Cooper, Elliot I.			

## CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bannister, William H.	McMillin, William B., Jr.
Bortko, Walter S.	
Coughlin, Richard D.	Mooney, Malcom T.
Current, Neal F.	Nielsen, Thomas H.
Dixon, Olin L., III	Osborne, Robert F.
Dodd, Joseph C.	Scott, William, Jr.
Dufour, Richard M.	Sullivan, Edward F.
Fail, Raymond P., Jr.	Sutley, Robert M.
Guernsey, John M.	Thorpe, Lowell T.
Jay, Robert R.	Whitehurst, Marshall N., Jr.
Larue, Van B.	
Longmire, Richard M.	Zimmerman, David C.
Lookabaugh, Guy J.	Zobel, William M.

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Ambrose, Edward A.	Drake, Wilbur R.
Anderson, Floyd H., Jr.	Elliot, Gordon E.
Bean, Willis E.	Elmore, Milford D.
Bender, Urban J.	Flournoy, Rollin H.
Bennett, Paul P., Jr.	Garver, Richard M.
Blackmon, Edward H.	Gill, Robert L.
Brown, Staley W.	Goding, Hubert M.
Browne, Weldon G., Jr.	Green, Gale R.
Bryant, Billy "B"	Green, William J., Jr.
Buckley, Emanuel N.	Guinn, John W.
Campbell, Howard B.	Gutekunst, Richard R.
Cloud, Joe W.	Harris, Albert C.
Cole, James R.	Havice, Andrew J.
Costa, John F.	Honish, Joseph E.
Daniel, Harold E.	Howard, Wallace R.
Dean, Jerdon, J.	Huff, Samuel L.
DeBerry, Patricia	Hughes, Robert G.
Dolan, William R.	Hypes, Kenton, Jr.
Doucet, Louis E.	Irvin, Ernest J.
	Johnson, Cecil R.



Jones, Earmon R.  
Jordan, Charles J.  
Jula, Paul N.  
Karrer, John L.  
Kirsch, Jean P.  
Knight, Jerry B.  
Kolb, William H.  
Koon, Robert L.  
Larson, Alfhild L.  
Leonard, Russell D.  
Lewis, Robert K.  
Lewis, Thomas W.  
Liedtke, Fred E.  
Longest, Clifford B.  
MacCraken, Raymond J.  
Mangham, Alonzo L., Jr.  
May, Carl R.  
Mayfield, Kenneth D.  
McClendon, Frank O., Jr.  
McDuffie, Wilbur B.  
McKay, Charles E.  
Meyer, Robert E.

Newman, Buther L., Jr.  
Oakes, Harry A.  
O'Neill, Joseph M.  
Owen, Orville K.  
Peake, Stanley C.  
Peppler, Leonard A.  
Pike, William B.  
Roman, Roy P.  
Rossan, Richard N.  
Shaffer, Weller J.  
Smith, Denson L.  
Steward, Edgar T.  
Tapscott, Donald E.  
Tedford, Charles F.  
Thompson, John M.  
Verme, Dominic A.  
Vise, Lee P.  
Walwick, Earle R.  
Wells, John E.  
White, Leland E.  
Wilson, James R.  
Wolf, John W.  
Wylie, David M.  
Young, Johnny W.

## NURSE CORPS

Beck, Anne C.  
Beveridge, Robina W.  
Branam, Stella P.  
Chandler, Rebecca  
Chart, Helen L.  
Cole, Helen M.  
English, Mary F.  
Fine, Rachel A.  
Gallineau, Billie J.  
Graves, Ellen G.  
Gurgul, Stephanie D.

Jordan, Reba B.  
Martin, Zuleime L.  
Meyer, Florence M.  
Michaud, Lucille M.  
Moore, Elizabeth J.  
Ortenzi, Filomena E.  
Parker, Viola J.  
Rinas, Agnes E.  
Smalling, Floy I.  
Trebbe, Myrtle F.  
Welcer, Mary F.

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent and temporary grades as indicated:

For permanent appointment:

## LIEUTENANT

Sellman, Lloyd E.

## LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Bayers, John A.  
Foster, Paul L.  
Piazza, Thomas J.  
Wills, Donald S.  
Lindgren, Paul W.

Jankovsky, Norlin A.  
Hartman, Willard R.  
Brown, Louis F.  
Boyd, Paul C.

## ENSIGN

Boyer, Charles L.  
Frost, Shirley D.  
Lemly, William D.  
Meyers, Walter T.  
Postak, John N.  
Ryan, William J.  
Sowinski, Stanislaus J.

Bolander, Jack C.  
Woods, Robert C.  
Wilson, Walter Q.  
Schwartz, Robert J.  
Hage, Jerald T.  
Guhl, M. John

For temporary promotion:

## LIEUTENANT

Bayers, John A.  
Piazza, Thomas J.  
Jankovsky, Norlin A.  
Hartman, Willard R.

Brown, Louis F.  
Boyd, Paul C.  
Foster, Paul L.

The following-named ensigns of the line of the Navy for transfer to and permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

Agee, Aaron B.  
Bigelow, David S.

Falk, Harvey A., Jr.  
Merica, Charles A.

Mitchell, Thomas J.  
Olson, Paul D.  
Tombari, Henry A.

Williams, Edward J., Jr.  
Yoshihira, Takesha

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Amick, Donald D.  
Anderson, James L.  
Arceneaux, Ewell J.  
Arnold, Ray W.  
Bracey, Monroe L.  
Cappelletto, Nicholas  
Cutler, Lamont M.  
Day, Leslie P.  
Dubois, John H.  
Fitzsimmons, Raymond F.  
Fritz, Ivan L. P., Jr.  
Fullinwider, John A.  
Garner, George M.  
Gidley, Ross E.  
Godenius, Walter E. G.  
Gordon, Abie  
Greibenstein, Edward E., Jr.  
Hammons, Elvis G.  
Harris, James B., Jr.  
Layman, Daniel F.

Lee, Joseph L.  
Long, Guy M., Sr.  
Luttge, William G.  
Matson, Kenneth S.  
McAlexander, Donald E.  
Mullen, Joseph E., Jr.  
Newman, Jack W.  
Palonis, Anthony J., Jr.  
Parker, Roy I.  
Perkins, Hewitt C.  
Ruttigan, James W.  
Ridgway, George A.  
Simmons, Bernard P.  
Skinner, Richard F.  
Sperry, Willard J.  
Steward, Jimmie L.  
Vuckovich, Joe  
Werder, Robert J.  
White, John L.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ziegler, Adolph.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## American Foreign Policy

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered last night before the convention of the Tax Executives Institute, Inc., at New York City.

There being no objection; the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE TAX EXECUTIVES INSTITUTE, INC., WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1955

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, American foreign policy is the people's business. There is no American man, woman, or child who will not be affected directly or indirectly by the present and future aspects of our foreign policy.

Our basic foreign policy is and should be peace with honor. This is far different from a policy of peace at any price.

As an example of our ultimate objective, I would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north where for a long period of our history neither that country nor ours has found it necessary to have forts or military establishments for the purpose of defending one country against the other along the entire international frontier of 3,000 miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We certainly hope that in our lifetime or the lifetime of our children all other nations

not only in the Western Hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, might live together as good neighbors as we do with Canada.

If we are half as prudent as those who gave us this Republic and later ones who preserved the Union or helped to win and develop the great West, we will continue to work, hope, and pray for peace but we will keep our powder dry.

A climate is being promoted—in the Communist propaganda broadcasts, by party-line followers overseas and within the United States and by many good people who may honestly believe that even a survival under Communist tyranny would be preferable to the risk of no survival at all in the event of World War II—that anyone who questions Soviet good intentions is a warmonger.

According to this line of reasoning, George Washington would be considered a warmonger for having joined our other Founding Fathers in striking a blow for freedom.

Abraham Lincoln would fall into the same category for having taken the provocative step of supplying the Federal garrison at Fort Sumter.

And as for Patrick Henry—he, too, would be muzzled for his speech wherein he said:

"Is life so sweet and peace so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, almighty God. I care not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

On Wednesday, May 11, the Soviet Union proposed three resolutions in order to retain the initiative in carrying out their long-term policies.

When the veneer of propaganda and doubletalk is removed we can see the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and obstruct rather than to clarify and expedite. The Soviet proposal is a fraud.

Let us examine their so-called disarmament proposal:

1. It would destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the

free nations of the world relating to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world as they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information they have nothing to lose.

2. The proposal claims a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. It provides for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces in Germany back across the Atlantic Ocean to the United States (approximately 3,600 miles), whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement (it would be the first time in a quarter of a century that they would have) their forces would only be approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would at first also contemplate two Germans—like divided Korea and Vietnam—each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the Western NATO defense alliance.

4. Our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a requisite for discontinuing the arms race. We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

5. Our industrial and scientific atomic know-how to be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

6. The proposal contemplates yielding to Chinese Communist demands for Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations and removal of the provocative 7th Fleet from the Far East, all of which con-

tribute in Communist eyes to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

7. It would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

8. All the above steps to be carried out prior to getting down to the problems of an effective disarmament with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations "agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954."

Since the free-world forces as of that date are known and the Communist forces are not, it sets as the starting point for future moves a topheavy Communist base.

In free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations is subject to debate and vote in parliament and congress and can be readily checked now.

In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely on their official figures 1 month after the Convention enters into force.

Unless and until Communist China becomes a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Since without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon communism could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this weapon and the testing of the same works to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5 wherein it states "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces . . . the states . . . assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

In the first phase of 1956, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad and return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic, and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific, whereas the Soviet Union pulls back 600 miles at the most.

The production of all atomic weapons to cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities are known and the Soviet locations are not known, and there is no adequate inspection system provided, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

The subsequent assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals of the United States in the atomic- and conventional-weapon field is still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then sets up a limited type of inspection and control similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since this system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now advises it in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, to Yalta, and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China, and to Geneva and its impact upon Vietnam.

The heads of the free governments will be accountable and responsible to their people and to their Parliaments or Congress.

To whom will Bulganin be accountable? To the presidium or to Khrushchev? If Bulganin is indeed himself at the summit today, will he be there when the Big Four meet in June or July?

Are our western allies prepared to stand against a condemnation to perpetual slavery behind the Iron Curtain of the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania,

Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, North Korea, and China?

Are we to insist on previous agreements being honored before we take the Soviet's word on a new scrap of paper?

Will plans for the Republic of Germany's part in a western defense be scrapped to placate the Russian bear?

We might recall Kipling's *The Truce of the Bear*. While this was written concerning the Imperial Russia of the Czar, it is more applicable to Soviet Russia today.

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;

"When he stands up as pleading in wavering, man-brute guise,

"When he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes;

"When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer;

"That is the time of peril—the time of the truce of the bear."

Will we insist on the Soviet Union withdrawing, as pledged, their troops from Rumania and Hungary when the Austrian Treaty is signed? Their only excuse for being in those two countries was to keep open lines of communication to their troops in Austria. Or will this promise also be overlooked in order not to offend the Muscovites?

There is no real reliable evidence to date that would warrant a prudent person in believing that the Soviet Union or international communism have changed their basic long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom. In discussing American foreign policy before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D. C., on April 22, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, said:

"The Communist enemy, regardless of any momentary change of tactics, regardless of any treaty the Kremlin may sign, is bent on conquering the entire world—the United States not excluded—and remolding it in the form of the totalitarian dictatorship and slave economy imposed on the people behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia, Rumania, Outer Mongolia, and on the Chinese mainland. American labor never can be, and never will, be submissive or neutral toward such a total menace."

Certainly, American businessmen and the public generally should be no less alert to the dangers of communism than is the American Federation of Labor, as so ably and courageously expressed by the president of that great organization.

International treachery, individual and collective deception, high-level assassination, and rank and file cold-blooded murder have been, and are, today accepted Communist doctrine. The Communist leopard has not changed its spots, because Chou En-lai and Molotov happen to smile rather than to frown on any given day.

Our foreign policy should be based on human freedom. What advances it we should support, and what retards it we should oppose.

The age of colonialism in Asia is dead. The people in that part of the world want no part of it. Any American policy in that part of the world will suffer a handicap if it is tied directly or indirectly to European colonialism.

Nowhere in the long history of Russia under the Czars or under the Commissars is there anything equal to the United States establishing the free and independent Philippine Republic nor, for that matter, is there anything equal to Great Britain setting up a free and independent India, Pakistan, and Burma.

To the contrary, during the same period the Soviet Union was destroying the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, though they had signed treaties of friendship and nonaggression with all three of those Baltic Republics.

Americans must never lose sight of the fact that ours—at the time of our independence and today—is the authentic revolution. It not only freed us from colonial rule, but it developed a charter of liberty which established a constitutional form of government to serve us for all time to come.

Other nations have had their revolutions, but either immediately or in the not distant future the people found they had supplanted one ruler for an even more despotic one.

We should be proud of our revolutionary past and help to encourage in the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain the revolutionary zeal for freedom which won us a nation.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the aggressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties, including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

How can our associates even consider compromising principle and honor to that extent? What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

How long is the United Nations going to pussyfoot on this question of American prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice? Of the 15 the Chinese Communists admit holding, 11 have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years.

These men were shot down in January of 1953. Last fall it was suggested in Government quarters than public discussion be held down until Mr. Hammarskjöld had completed his mission to Peiping.

He came back in January and held a press conference in New York on January 14 in which he admitted that the prisoners had not been released nor did he have any firm commitment as to when they would be released.

It was suggested again in Government and United Nations quarters that the American Congress and the American people be patient and that perhaps Chou En-lai would release them prior to the Bandung Conference.

The Bandung Conference has now come and gone and the prisoners have not been released.

Are we expected to wait until these prisoners have been completely brainwashed and



then released to serve the Communist propaganda purposes as has been the case of some of the civilians?

It is time for Mr. Hammarskjöld to make his report to the United Nations and to the people of America.

What is intended to be done about Communist failure to comply with the terms of the Korean armistice?

If the United Nations as an organization is paralyzed from taking action, then the Government of the United States has an obligation to men wearing the uniform of this country to take some effective steps in getting our men released.

There was a time at the turn of the century when a single American civilian held as a captive brought from President Theodore Roosevelt the effective ultimatum: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Now our associates want to reward the Communists with membership in the United Nations.

Have we forgotten the biblical injunction in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?"

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu and admission into the United Nations. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and the Pescadores.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist-pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou en-lai.

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American's."

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way."

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time."

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

## Export of Scrap Iron and Steel

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, whatever may be the intentions, some of our shortsighted policies are actually helping Soviet Russia. There seems to be considerable confusion between the Department of Commerce and the Department of State over the matter of the export of scrap iron from the United States. I do not think it is too much to ask that the Department of Commerce and the Department of State pass 1 or 2 resolutions, first, that they are part of the same Government; and, second, that it might be well, since they might agree that they are part of the same Government, to have a uniform policy on a matter which affects our foreign trade and foreign policy.

Our domestic steel industry is trying to compel Western Europe to buy semi-finished steel or finished steel. They are trying to prohibit export of scrap iron and seem to have the blessing of the Department of Commerce in doing so. As a result, they are unknowingly or otherwise providing Russia with a powerful lever to force Western Europe to ship copper to them, despite the free world shortage of copper and the fact that it is a strategic material badly needed in Russia.

I respectfully suggest it is time for the White House to take a look at conflicting

viewpoints between the Department of State and the Department of Commerce on this issue, and establish an American policy that takes into account what Russia is doing to take advantage of the present situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Wednesday, April 13, telling of a talk on this situation by Eliot Janeway, a recognized authority on economic research.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRAP EXPORT IMPASSE SEEN AIDING RUSSIA—REDS GETTING COPPER IN DEAL WITH BRITAIN, ECONOMIST REPORTS

The problem of export of scrap iron and steel to Europe is tied in with Russian procurement of copper and presents a knotty problem to the administration in Washington, in the opinion of a New York economist.

Eliot Janeway, of New York, editor of Janeway's Memos, an economic service to business, was in Pittsburgh last night to address the advance management group of the School of Industrial Administration of Carnegie Institute of Technology in Webster Hall Hotel.

### DECISION UP TO WHITE HOUSE

Many of the ideas discussed with a reporter were touched upon in the economist's address.

It is his opinion that the White House will have to decide the question of whether unrestricted scrap exports to Europe shall be permitted. At present, there is a trickle of scrap exports under license.

The State Department has decided there is no scrap shortage in the United States, while the Commerce Department is in the corner of steel producers, who wish scrap exports to be prohibited. The steel industry says, in effect, that if Europe needs metals, it should buy semi-finished or finished steel.

### RUSSIA SHIPPING TO ENGLAND

During the impasse, according to Janeway, Russia is shipping pig iron to England at a delivered price slightly under the delivered price of American steel scrap there. As part of the pig iron deal, there is a reciprocity arrangement, he said, whereby England supplies Russia with badly needed copper.

Janeway said that the decision on larger scrap steel exports should be made on a basis of the least cost to the American economy. In any event, he is in favor of permitting scrap exports only if the steel made from it is used by Western Europe for defense purposes.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the inspiration of all sincere and earnest prayers and their only answer, help us to believe and know that the secret of a happy and victorious life is to be found in a mind and heart inhabited and controlled by Thy Spirit.

May we begin this new week with the glad assurance that what we need more than anything else in the strain and stress of life, both for our peace and power, is Thy divine presence and guidance.

Inspire us with the certainty that there are no crises we cannot face, no temptations we cannot master, no problems we cannot solve, no wrongs we cannot set right, and no victories for righteousness and justice we cannot win when Thou art our companion and counselor.

Grant that we may never become disheartened and discouraged as we continue to set ourselves to the difficult task of building a nobler civilization and seek to help all mankind achieve the highest and happiest kind of life.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1955, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Saliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;